

BIBLIOTHEQUE DU PARLEMENT
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT



3 2354 00409 656 9

DATE DUE

APR 15 2005

Canada. Parliament. House of
Commons. Select Standing Comm.
on Agriculture and Coloniza-
tion, 1928. (Re immigration)
Minutes of proceedings and
evidence....

DATE

NAME - NOM

Canada. Parliament. House of
Commons. Select Standing Comm.on
Agriculture and Colonization,
1928.

J

103

H7

1928


A3I

A1

108	15	255	

Canada, Parliament, House of
 Commons, Select Standing Com-
 on Agriculture and Coloniza-
 tion, 1925. (Re Immigration)
 Minutes of proceedings and
 evidence.

Canada, Parliament, House of
 Commons, Select Standing Com. on
 Agriculture and Colonization,
 1928.



10-11-78
APPENDIX No. 8

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE
AND REPORT

In respect to the consideration of the subject of Immigration, the Immigration Act and Regulations and the work of the Department of Immigration and Colonization

SESSION - 1928



OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1928

Price, \$1.00



APPENDIX No. 8

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE
AND REPORT

In respect to the consideration of the subject of Immigration, the Immigration Act and Regulations and the work of the Department of Immigration and Colonization

SESSION - 1928



OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1928



FRANK W. S.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND FINANCIAL

AND REPORT

In pursuance of the provisions of the Act relating to the
the Finance and the Colonization and the
of the Department of Agriculture

SECTION 100



REPORT

SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND RURALIZATION REPORT

House of Commons

Wednesday, June 6, 1923

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. Order of Reference.....	iv
2. Report.....	v
3. Minutes of Proceedings.....	xiii
4. Minutes of Evidence.....	1
5. Productions Filed.....	732
6. Index to Productions.....	826
7. Index of Witnesses.....	825

TABLE OF CONTENTS
ORDER OF REFERENCE

MONDAY, 20th February, 1928.

Ordered,—That the Immigration Act and regulations thereunder, and the general subject of Immigration, including the work of the Department of Immigration and Colonization, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization for consideration and report.

Attest.

ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,
Clerk of the House.

REPORT

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION REPORT

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
WEDNESDAY, June 6, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization begs leave to present its Tenth Report as follows:—

Pursuant to an Order of Reference dated Monday, February 20, 1928, your Committee took into its consideration the Immigration Act and Regulations thereunder, and the general subject of immigration, including the work of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

Your Committee has held thirty-six sittings and has called before it the following twenty-nine witnesses, namely:—

- Hon. Robert Forke, Minister of Immigration and Colonization.
- W. J. Egan, Deputy Minister of Immigration.
- A. L. Jolliffe, Commissioner, Department of Immigration.
- Dr. J. A. Amyot, Deputy Minister, Department of Health.
- Dr. D. A. Clark, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Health.
- W. J. Black, Director of Colonization, Canadian National Railways.
- J. S. Dennis, Director of Colonization, Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
- J. N. K. Macalister, Assistant Director of Colonization, Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
- Sir Henry Thornton, President, Canadian National Railways.
- E. W. Beatty, President, Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
- Canon Vernon, Church of England.
- Canon Burd, Church of England, Saskatchewan Synod.
- Miss Gertrude Childs, Secretary of the Social Welfare Commission of Winnipeg.
- Sir Joseph Flavelle, Toronto.
- Albert Chamberlain, President, British Welcome and Welfare League of Toronto.
- Hugh Farthing, Representative of the British Empire League of Canada.
- Professor H. Barton, Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture, McGill.
- Hon. George Langley, Regina.
- Miss M. E. Mackie, former Immigration and Colonization worker.
- C. A. Magrath, Toronto.
- Col. James Stibbard, of the British Permanent Forces.
- Col. T. R. Tudge, of the Salvation Army.
- Staff-Captain Owen Culshaw, of the Salvation Army.
- M. J. Coldwell, Regina.
- Hon. Mr. Manion, M.P.
- Hon. E. J. McMurray, Winnipeg.
- M. N. Campbell, M.P.
- Lieut.-Col Cecil G. Williams, of the Navy League.
- George H. Corbett, representing several Social Service Welfare Societies of Montreal.

In addition to hearing the foregoing witnesses your Committee took under consideration resolutions and petitions submitted by various organizations throughout the country.

Your Committee begs leave to report its conclusions and recommendations as follows, namely:—

REPORT

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH CITIZENS OF VARIOUS COUNTRIES ARE ADMITTED TO CANADA

The Committee is convinced that there is considerable misapprehension and lack of information regarding conditions on which persons from different parts of the world are admitted to Canada. In order to remove this misapprehension and to have a clear background on which to base any recommendation, the Committee gives the following brief summary.

British.

1. All British subjects from the United Kingdom or from any of the British Dominions are eligible to enter Canada, provided they are sound mentally and physically and in a position to maintain themselves until employment can be secured.

No passport is required.

The passage rate for immigrants from the British Isles generally is \$91.25.

2. British agricultural workers are specially encouraged by the establishment of a low rate of \$9.73 at the instance of the Canadian Government.

3. British domestic workers are also provided for at the same rate as agricultural workers and in special cases even this small amount is advanced as a loan.

4. Families of British agricultural workers who have already emigrated to Canada are given the benefit of the special rate of \$9.73 for adults and free passage to all children under seventeen. In this case, also, loans are made in special cases to provide for the transportation of such families.

5. British children over fourteen and under seventeen who are brought into Canada under the auspices of certain juvenile societies, have their passages paid; and an additional amount is paid to such societies to cover the railroad fares and incidental expenses of such children.

6. British boys over fourteen and under seventeen years of age, emigrating to Canada to approved farm homes, receive free passage to their destination.

Northern European Countries—(Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium and France)

Any subjects or citizens of these countries are eligible for entry to Canada provided they are sound mentally and physically and are in a position to maintain themselves until employment can be secured.

These people are required to have passports.

The average minimum ocean rate is approximately \$120.

No special rate or assistance of any kind is given by the Canadian Government to subjects or citizens of these countries.

Central and Southern European Countries—(Austria, Hungary, Poland, Roumania, Lithuania, Esthonia, Latvia, Bulgaria, Jugo-Slavia, Czecho-Slovakia)

Only agricultural workers, domestic servants or those within a prescribed degree of relationship to residents already legally admitted to Canada are permitted to come in from these countries. Special exceptions may be made in cases in which the Minister of Immigration is satisfied that their labour or service is required in Canada.

These people are required to have passports.

The average minimum ocean rate is approximately \$135.

No special rate or assistance of any kind is given by the Canadian Government to subjects or citizens of these countries.

United States.

All citizens of the United States are eligible to emigrate to Canada provided they are sound mentally and physically and in a position to maintain themselves until employment can be secured.

No passport is required.

From the above it will be seen that emigrants from the United Kingdom stand in a specially favourable position as compared with emigrants from Continental countries, not only with regard to general passage rates but particularly with respect to the very greatly reduced rates given to agricultural and domestic workers from the United Kingdom.

For the further encouragement of British immigration the following Schemes for land settlement should be noted:—

3,000 Family Scheme

British families have been brought out to Canada at a special steamship rate, and are located by the Canadian Government on vacant soldier settlement lands. The British Government supplies to each such family a maximum of \$1,500 cash for stock and equipment. All repayments are made by the settler for the price of the farm and for the stock and equipment loan, in equal yearly instalments, during a period of twenty-five years at the low interest rate of 5 per cent. The Canadian Government provides additional assistance by way of selection, settlement and supervision, free of charge.

British-Dominion-Provincial Land Settlement Scheme

Under this Scheme the Provincial Government provides the farm. The British Government supplies \$1,500 for stock and equipment. The Canadian Government recruits the settler and provides settlement and supervision, free of charge, and, in addition, shares on a 50-50 basis any loss on account of stock and equipment. In the event of the default of a settler within the first two years the loss of interest on account of the purchase price of the land is shared on the following basis:—

	Per cent.
Provincial Government	25
Dominion "	25
British "	50

This Scheme has already been adopted by two of the Provinces and negotiations are now being carried on with another province.

Training and Placement of British Boys in Farm Homes

Selected boys are given free passage from the United Kingdom to Canada, and institutions known as "training farms" are established by several provinces for receiving these British boys and distributing them among approved farm homes. The Dominion and Provincial Governments each contribute \$10 per boy towards the operation of the farm, and the British Government makes a grant of \$20 for the same purpose.

Land Settlement for British Boys.

The object is to establish on farms of their own, British boys who have come to Canada, and who have acquired the necessary experience in farm work, and who have each saved \$500. Under this Scheme the British Government loans

\$1,250, the Dominion Government \$1,000, the Provincial Government \$250 and these loans, with the boy's savings, aggregate \$3,000 which is available for his settlement on the farm.

To indicate the importance of this work the British and Canadian Governments have entered into an agreement to spend \$5,000,000 during the next ten years in making such loans.

As illustrating the special efforts put forward to encourage British immigration, the evidence shows that the Canadian Department of Immigration spends in this work \$16.67 for each British immigrant as compared with an average cost of 11 cents per head for immigrants from the Continental countries.

The Committee heard evidence in detail respecting the organization of the Department of Immigration and concerning all phases of its activities as carried on both separately and in conjunction with many governmental and voluntary organizations, and in relation thereto the Committee makes the following recommendation and suggestions.

Federal Responsibility.

In the opinion of the Committee the responsibility and control of the selection of immigrants, no matter by whom recruited must rest solely and exclusively with the Government of Canada.

Provincial Co-operation.

The Committee recommends that special efforts be now made to extend the field of activity of the Provincial Authorities particularly in the matter of placement, settlement and supervision of immigrants, and that, with this in view, the Federal Government consider contributing to defray the cost of Provincial co-operation for that purpose.

Medical Examination

There have been complaints about the new system of medical inspection under which Canadian doctors conduct the medical examination of prospective immigrants in the United Kingdom. It appears that this new system was inaugurated as a result of representations made to the Department of Immigration by steamship companies, by Provincial Governments, by the Dominion Council of Health, and by other Social Service Organizations.

Several reasons were urged in favour of the change:

1. Great hardship was imposed on the immigrant who had been passed by the medical inspectors in the United Kingdom and then upon coming to Canada was subsequently rejected on arrival or after admission.
2. A large number of deportations have taken place on account of the mental or physical unfitness of those who had been passed as mentally and physically fit before leaving the United Kingdom.
3. The proportions of immigrants committed to mental institutions in Canada has been excessive.

The new system affords free medical examination of prospective immigrants by Canadian doctors before they take passage for Canada. Twenty-one Canadian doctors and forty-five Roster doctors are conducting medical inspection in the British Isles, and there are 332 centres where medical examinations are conducted, and, in addition, special provisions are made for medical examination in isolated communities.

On the Continent there are seven Canadian doctors whose work is confined to examining all emigrants at the continental ports of embarkation. Previous to this examination by Canadian doctors the Continental emigrant is subjected to a medical examination near his home under the auspices of the steamship company. Quarantine, fumigation and other precautions are exacted at the Continental ports of embarkation in addition to the medical examination by the Canadian doctor.

The suggestion was made that the volume of emigration from the British Isles to Canada was being reduced by the new medical arrangement, but the evidence shows that there has been a greater decrease in emigration from the British Isles to the other Overseas Dominions and to the United States.

The committee was impressed with the fact that the medical officers to whom is entrusted the medical examination of intending emigrants have a serious responsibility to Canada, not only to the Federal government but also to the provinces. It is their duty to ascertain that intending emigrants are physically and mentally fit to take their places and do their share as Canadian citizens. In this connection, and more particularly with regard to emigration from the Continent of Europe the Committee quotes the resolution passed by the Social Service Council of Canada at its meeting recently held in Montreal as follows:

"The Social Service Council of Canada having in mind the burden now laid on the various provinces of Canada in providing for the idiots and the insane, and the unfortunate results of admission into this country of the moron and feeble minded, desires to urge upon the Federal government a continued and strict adherence to the provisions of the Immigration Act, in order that the door may not be open for the entrance of these types of prohibited undesirables."

Owing to the present arrangements a considerable amount of misunderstanding and dissatisfaction has arisen during the transition period. Certain objections were mentioned by witnesses, some of which have already been remedied. The present system of medical examination in the British Isles was inaugurated primarily for the benefit and protection of the British immigrant. The Department of Immigration and the Department of Health should, it is considered, make the most exhaustive efforts to see that the new system is perfected so as to eliminate, as far as possible, inconvenience, delay and expense to the prospective immigrant, and to dispel the idea that there is any intention, on the part of the Canadian government, to restrict or hinder the coming to Canada of British subjects. For this purpose the committee recommends that the present system would be improved and that it would obviate delay and inconvenience to the prospective emigrant, especially those who reside in the rural districts of the British Isles if the examinations were made by British local doctors paid by, and under the supervision and control of, the Canadian medical authorities, who should be located at convenient centres of population.

SPECIAL PASSAGE RATES FOR BRITISH SETTLERS

1. *'Teen Age.*

The Committee approves of all previous efforts to promote and encourage 'teen age immigration from Great Britain and recommends that the age limit for boy immigrants be extended to boys 14 to 19 years of age, both inclusive.

2. *Domestics.*

That the arrangements now in effect for the movement of domestics from the United Kingdom to Canada be continued.

3. *Family Re-union.*

That measures be taken to extend the assisted passage privileges to the families of immigrants from Great Britain who are now in Canada and who have so far established themselves as to have a reasonable prospect of being able to support their families in this country.

4. *Reduction in Ocean Rates for all British Immigrants.*

That measures be taken at an early date to arrange a conference between the Federal and British Governments and the Atlantic Steamship Companies with the object of obtaining a reduction in ocean rates to British immigrants to approximately £10.

Railway Rates for Canadian Landseekers

The committee also recommends that measures be taken to ascertain whether the railways will restore the Home Seekers rates in effect prior to the war, making such rates effective East bound as well as West bound.

Land Settlement

1. The committee having heard the evidence in connection with the experiment of the 3,000 Family Settlement Scheme, now almost completed, recommends that time be given to test this form of land settlement before embarking upon extended schemes of this character.

2. The committee approves of the extension to other provinces of the tripartite agreement with the British, Federal and Provincial governments for the encouragement of Land Settlement by the British immigrant.

3. The committee recommends, subject to the completion of satisfactory arrangements with governments of the provinces, that assistance equal to that given by the British government to British emigrant boys be extended by the government of Canada to the Canadian youth who are trained in agriculture.

Letters of Assurance of Employment. ("Permits"—so called)

Your committee recommends that letters of assurance of employment shall state the names, addresses, occupations and nationality of the persons to be admitted and that an annual return be made by the Minister of Immigration to parliament within thirty days of its meeting, giving particulars of all such letters, showing the names of persons so admitted, their addresses, occupation and nationality, the names and addresses of the persons who made the application for each such admission and of any other person who endorsed or made favourable representations in support of such application.

RAILWAYS' CONTINENTAL AGREEMENT

There was in the evidence, considerable criticism of certain features of the Railways' Agreement. The Committee has some doubt as to the desirability of giving to the Railways special authority to recruit immigrants, but as certain restrictions were imposed in connection with the renewal of the Agreement in October, 1927, the Committee is of the opinion that, in order to ascertain the results of its operation under the new conditions, the present Agreement might

be continued according to its terms, but with this exception—that the system of nominations of immigrants from non-preferred countries under the Railways' Agreement should be confined forthwith to the following degrees of relationship: father or mother, husband or wife, son or daughter, brother or sister—of any individual who is now engaged in farming in Canada, and further that the existing Railways' Agreement should not be renewed in its present form.

INCREASING EMPLOYMENT

Your committee would also recommend that the government make an intensive and comprehensive study of the possibilities of increasing industrial and agricultural development in Canada with a view to attracting capital and providing wider and increased opportunities for employment not only for our own people, but for prospective immigrants.

Your Committee recommends that 1,500 copies in English and 500 copies in French of the minutes of evidence and of this report, be printed in Blue Book form, and that standing order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

A copy of the Minutes of Procedure and Evidence is appended hereto for information of the House.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

W. F. KAY,

Chairman.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, March 8, 1928.

The committee came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay, the chairman, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Arthurs, Bancroft, Benoit, Bouchard, Boys, Brown, Cahan, Campbell, Carmichael, Casgrain, Charters, Coote, Descoteaux, Donnelly, Dubuc, Edwards, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Garland (Carleton), Glen, Guthrie, Kay, Lucas, McGibbon, McMillan, McPhee, McRae, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Ross, Senn, Sinclair (Wellington North), Spence, Stewart, Stirling, Tolmie, Totzke.

Preceding the consideration of the Order of the Day, it was moved by Mr. Millar and the motion carried that the committee again take under consideration on Thursday, the 15th inst., the subject order of reference,—the grading and inspection of wheat,—protein content,—provided that the attendance of Dr. Birchard of Winnipeg may be secured for that date.

The committee then proceeded to the consideration of the subject order of reference, viz:—

That the Immigration Act and Regulations thereunder and the general subject of Immigration, including the work of the Department of Immigration and Colonization be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization for consideration and report.

The order and method of procedure to be followed by the committee in its consideration of this subject was discussed at some length but nothing definite was formulated.

Mr. W. J. Egan, deputy minister of Immigration and Colonization, was then called, sworn and examined and instructed to appear for further examination at the next meeting.

The meeting then adjourned till Tuesday, March 13, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, March 13, 1928

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Bancroft, Bouchard, Boys, Brown, Campbell, Carmichael, Casgrain, Charters, Coote, Descoteaux, Donnelly, Duff, Edwards, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Garland (Carleton), Glen, Guthrie, Hodgins, Kay, Lucas, McMillan, McPhee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Senn, Sinclair (Queens), Spence, Spotton, Stewart, Stirling, Tolmie, Totzke, Young.

On the opening of proceedings discussion took place as to the propriety of submitting the evidence of witnesses to such witnesses before having same printed, and also as to having witnesses sworn.

The committee decided to have the witnesses sworn.

Dr. J. A. Amyot, deputy minister of the Department of Health, was called, sworn and examined.

The committee decided that Mr. W. J. Egan, deputy minister of Immigration and Colonization, be called for further examination at the next meeting.

The committee then adjourned till Wednesday, March 14, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, March 14, 1928.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Bancroft, Benoit, Bowen, Cahan, Carmichael, Casgrain, Charters, Descoteaux, Donnelly, Duff, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Garland (Carleton), Glen, Guthrie, Kay, Lucas, McGibbon, McKenzie, McPhee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Seguin, Senn, Sinclair (Queens), Sinclair (Wellington North), Spence, Spotton, Stewart, Stirling, Tolmie, Totzke, Vallance, Young.

The subject of reference, namely, Immigration Inquiry, was again taken under consideration.

Mr. W. J. Egan, deputy minister of the Department of Immigration and Colonization, having been previously sworn, was called and examined.

On the conclusion of the examination of the witness, Mr. Cahan moved, seconded by Mr. Stewart, that Mr. Black, Colonization Agent of the Canadian National Railways, and Mr. Dennis of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or their respective assistants be summoned to attend and give evidence before the committee on Tuesday, the 20th, and Wednesday, the 21st, days of March. The motion carried.

Mr. Millar submitted that it should be understood that the committee would take under consideration the subject of reference, the Grading and Inspection of Wheat, on Thursday, the 22nd inst., and that the Chief Grain Inspector of the Board of Grain Commissioners be summoned to attend at that date.

The committee then adjourned to take up the further consideration of the subject respecting Immigration on Tuesday, the 20th inst., at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
WEDNESDAY, March 21, 1928.

The committee was called to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Arthurs, Bancroft, Bowen, Boys, Brown, Cahan, Carmichael, Casgrain, Charters, Descoteaux, Dubuc, Donnelly, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Garland (Carleton), Garland (Bow River), Glen, Guthrie, Kay, Lanctot, Lucas, McKenzie, McMillan, McPhee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Rowe, Senn, Sinclair (Queens), Sinclair (Wellington North), Spence, Spotton, Stewart, Stirling, Tolmie, Totzke, Young.

Before taking under consideration the subject set for the Order of the Day, Mr. Millar called the attention of the committee to the printed evidence of the witness Dr. F. J. Birchard taken before the committee on March 15th, and stated that the witness desired to make certain extensive corrections and revision of his evidence which would involve the reprinting of the same.

Mr. Millar then moved that the evidence of Dr. Birchard of March 15th be reprinted as corrected and revised by the witness. The motion carried.

The committee then took under consideration again the subject of Immigration.

Mr. W. J. Egan, deputy-minister of Immigration and Colonization, was then called before the committee and submitted to examination by several members of the committee. The witness then retired.

Mr. J. N. K. Macalister, Assistant Commissioner of the Department of Colonization and Development of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, having been duly summoned appeared before the committee, was sworn and having been examined, retired to appear again on Friday, the 23rd inst., at 11 a.m.

It was decided that witnesses Mr. Macalister and Mr. W. J. Black, Director of Colonization of the Canadian National Railways, should be summoned to appear before the committee at its next meeting on Friday, the 23rd inst.

The committee then adjourned for the further consideration of this subject till Friday, the 23rd inst., at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
TUESDAY, March 27, 1928.

The committee came to order at 11 a.m. Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bancroft, Bouchard, Bowen, Boys, Cahan, Carmichael, Casgrain, Charters, Coote, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Glen, Kay, Lanctôt, Lucas, McKenzie, McMillan, Millar, Moran, Motherwell, Ralston, Rowe, Senn, Sinclair (Queens), Spence, Spotton, Tolmie, Totzke, Young.

The committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Mr. J. N. K. Macalister was recalled, examined and retired, to appear again at the next meeting.

The witness filed certain sample copies of advertisements used by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company Colonization Department in Great Britain.

The committee then adjourned till Wednesday, March 28, 1928.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
WEDNESDAY, March 28, 1928.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bancroft, Bowen, Boys, Brown, Cahan, Carmichael, Charters, Edwards, Forke, Glen, Hodgins, Kay, Lucas, McGibbon, McKenzie, McPhee, Millar, Ralston, Sinclair (Queens), Sinclair (Wellington North), Spence, Spotton, Stewart, Stirling, Totzke.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of immigration.

Discussion as to the subsequent order of proceedings of the Committee, took place and action was deferred till after the Easter recess.

Mr. J. N. K. Macalister was recalled, examined and retired.

Witness discharged.

Discussion took place as to the date of the next sitting of the Committee and on motion of Mr. Ralston, adopted, the chairman was instructed to report to the House recommending that the Committee be given leave to sit while the House is in session. The date of the next sitting of the Committee was left to the Chairman and Mr. Ralston.

It was subsequently decided to convene the Committee for Friday the 30th March at 11 a.m., Mr. W. J. Black, director of the Colonization Department of the Canadian National Railways to attend.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
FRIDAY, March 30, 1928.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs Bancroft, Benoit, Boulanger, Bowen, Boys, Brown, Cahan, Campbell, Carmichael, Casgrain, Coote, Descoteaux, Donnelly, Edwards, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Glen, Kay, Lucas, McKenzie, McPhee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Rowe, Senn, Spence, Spotton, Stewart, Tolmie, Totzke, Young.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Dr. W. J. Black, Director of Colonization, Canadian National Railways, was called, sworn, examined and retired.

Mr. W. J. Egan, Deputy Minister of Immigration and Colonization filed a statement of "Immigration under the auspices of the Scottish Immigrant Aid Society, showing movement and cost from the first April, 1922, to the end of November, 1927."

A motion by Mr. Cahan, that the Chairman report to the House recommending the reduction of the quorum of the committee from twenty to twelve members, was carried.

The committee adjourned till Thursday April 12th, at 11 a.m., when Mr. Black will again attend.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, April 13, 1928.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m. Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bancroft, Cahan, Carmichael, Casgrain, Donnelly (Dubuc, Fansher, Forke, Glen, Kay, Lucas, McMillan, McPhee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Senn, Sinclair (Queens), Spence, Spotton, Vallance.

The subject of Immigration was again taken under consideration.

Dr. W. J. Black was recalled, examined and retired.

Witness discharged.

Mr. Cahan moved, seconded by Mr. Stewart that the following named persons be requested to attend before the committee, at dates to be arranged, to give their views on the subject under consideration; Sir Joseph Flavelle, Sir Henry Thornton, E. W. Beatty—Carried.

Mr. Ralston moved, seconded by Mr. McMillan that a sub-committee of five members, to be named by the chairman, be appointed to consider all communications addressed to the committee and to report thereon—Carried.

Subsequently the chairman named the following members of the committee to constitute the said sub-committee, viz.: Messrs. Cahan, Ralston, Edwards, Glen and Garland (Bow River).

The committee then adjourned at the call of the chair.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, April 19, 1928.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m. Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Bancroft, Benoit, Bouchard, Cahan, Campbell, Carmichael, Charters, Coote, Donnelly, Dubuc, Edwards, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Glen, Jacobs, Kay, Lucas, McGibbon, McKenzie, McMillan, McPhee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Rowe, Sinclair (Queens), Sinclair (Wellington North), Spence, Spotton, Stewart, Stirling, Totzke, Tummon, Vallance, Young.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Sir Henry Thornton, president of the Canadian National Railways was called, examined and retired.

Mr. Glen chairman of the sub-committee on communications and witnesses presented a report of the said committee recommending that the following persons be summoned to appear before the committee, viz:—

Colonel Tudge, of the Salvation Army; Montreal.

Albert Chamberlain, president of The British Welcome and Welfare League, Toronto.

Canon Burd, of the Anglican Synod of Saskatchewan, Prince Albert.

A representative of the Canadian Legion.

On motion of Mr. Cahan the recommendations of the sub-committee as contained in the said report was concurred in.

The committee then adjourned till Friday, April 20, at 11 o'clock.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, April 25, 1928.

The committee came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bancroft, Brown, Boulanger, Cahan, Campbell, Charters, Coote, Donnelly, Dubuc, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Glen, Jacobs, Kay, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Spence, Spotton, Stirling, Vallance, Young.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Mr. E. W. Beatty, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, was called before the committee, examined and retired.

The chairman of the sub-committee on correspondence and witnesses reported that this committee had considered a large file of correspondence addressed to the committee by Locals of the National Association of Canada and that as no request had been made by the said Association to be heard viva voce, that the said correspondence as received would be submitted to the committee for consideration.

The report of the sub-committee was concurred in.

Mr. Garland moved, seconded by Mr. Glen, that Mr. M. J. Coldwell of Regina be summoned to appear before the committee to give evidence in respect to the alleged abuse of the permit system.

Motion carried.

Mr. Campbell moved, seconded by Mr. Garland that the United Farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, respectively, be advised that if they wish to have a representative appear before the committee such representative will be heard.

Motion carried.

Mr. Cahan moved, seconded by Mr. Jacobs, that Mr. C. A. Magrath, chairman of the Ontario Hydro Commission, be invited to attend before the committee.

Motion carried.

The committee adjourned till Thursday, April 26th, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THURSDAY, April 26, 1928.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Arthurs, Bancroft, Boulanger, Brown, Campbell, Charters, Donnelly, Dubuc, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Glen, Kay, Lucas, McKenzie, McMillan, McPhee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Sinclair (Queens), Sinclair (Wellington North), Spotton, Stewart, Totzke.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Canon Walter Burd, of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, was called, sworn and examined.

At one o'clock the committee adjourned till four p.m.

The committee reconvened at four o'clock in the afternoon and the witness of the morning, Canon Burd, was again called to the stand. The witness having concluded his evidence at six o'clock was discharged.

Motion by Mr. Boulanger, seconded by Mr. Spotton, that Dr. H. Barton, Dean of Macdonald Agricultural College, be requested to appear before the committee, was carried.

Members present at the afternoon sitting: Messrs. Arthurs, Bancroft, Brown, Cahan, Donnelly, Dubuc, Boulanger, Fansher, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Glen, Kay, Lucas, McPhee, Millar, Ralston, Rowe, Spotton, Totzke, Vallance, Young.

The committee adjourned at the call of the chair.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, May 1, 1928.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m. Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present; Messrs. Anderson, Arthurs, Bancroft, Benoit, Boulanger, Carmichael, Casgrain, Charters, Coote, Donnelly, Edwards, Fransher, Forke, Glen, Kay, Lanctot, Lucas, McGibbon, McKenzie, McMillan, McPhee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Ross, Rowe, Senn, Stewart, Stirling, Totzke, Tummon, Vallance, Young.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Canon Vernon of Montreal, representing the Church of England Synod, was called, examined and retired.

Sir Joseph Flavelle, of Toronto, was called, examined and retired.

On motion of Mr. Young it was decided to advise the Hon. George Langley, of Regina, Saskatchewan, that the committee desire his attendance on Tuesday next.

It being now one o'clock the committee adjourned till four o'clock in the afternoon.

The meeting came to order at 4 o'clock, Mr. Kay in the chair.

Members present: Messrs. Arthurs, Bancroft, Boulanger, Brown, Carmichael, Coote, Donnelly, Forke, Glen, Kay, McKenzie, Ralston, Stewart, Totzke, Vallance, Young.

Miss Gertrude Childs, Secretary of the Social Welfare Commission of Winnipeg, was called, examined and retired.

The committee adjourned till Wednesday, May 2nd.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, May 2, 1928.

The Committee came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bancroft, Boulanger, Brown, Campbell, Carmichael, Donnelly, Fansher, Forke, Glen, Kay, Lucas, McKenzie, McMillan, Millar, Ralston, Vallance.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Albert Chamberlain, president of the British Welcome and Welfare League of Toronto, appeared before the Committee, was examined and retired.

It being one o'clock the Committee then adjourned till four o'clock in the afternoon.

The Committee reconvened at four p.m., Mr. Kay in the chair.

Members present: Messrs. Arthurs, Campbell, Coote, Donnelly, Fansher, Forke, Glen, Kay, Lucas, Maybee, Rowe, Sinclair (Wellington North), Spotton, Vallance.

Hugh Farthing of Calgary, representative of the Dominion Command of the British Empire Service League in Canada, appeared before the Committee, was examined and retired.

The Committee then adjourned till Thursday at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
THURSDAY, May 3, 1928.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bancroft, Boulanger, Bowen, Boys, Brown, Cahan, Campbell, Carmichael, Coote, Donnelly, Fansher, Forks, Glen, Kay, Lanctot, Lucas, McKenzie, Maybee, Ralston, Rowe, Sinclair (Wellington North), Spence, Spotton, Stewart, Stirling, Tolmie, Totzke, Tummon, Vallance, Young.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

C. A. Magrath, of Toronto, was called, examined, and retired.

John S. Dennis, Director of Immigration and Colonization of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, was then called and examined.

At one o'clock the Committee adjourned till four o'clock in the afternoon when the last witness of the morning was to continue his evidence.

At four o'clock, p.m., the Committee reconvened and Mr. Dennis was recalled to the stand and his examination completed. The witness then retired.

Colonel James Stibbard of the British Permanent Force, being present was invited to address the Committee and explained the scheme initiated by him in England to train, in agricultural pursuits, the men of the Permanent Force, as they are discharged from time to time, with the object and intent of fitting them for colonization work in the overseas Dominions.

Mr. Glen, chairman of the subcommittee on correspondence and witnesses presented a further report of the said Committee, recommending that the following named witnesses be called:—

Miss Esther Mackie, Montreal.

Professor Tate, McGill University.

A representative of the Prisoners' Welfare Association.

A representative of the Navy League of Canada.

The said subcommittee further recommended that no further witnesses other than departmental be called or heard after Wednesday, the ninth inst.

The recommendations of the said subcommittee were concurred in.

The Committee then adjourned till Friday, May 4th, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Friday, May 4, 1928.

The Committee came to order at 11 a.m. Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs Arthurs, Bancroft, Brown, Cahan, Charters, Coote, Donnelly, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Glen, Kay, Lucas, McKenzie, McMillan, Millar, Ralston, Sinclair (Wellington North), Spence, Spotton, Stewart, Stirling, Tummon, Vallance.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

H. Barton, Professor of Agriculture, Macdonald College, McGill University, was called, examined and retired.

Motion by Mr. Coote that the Department of Immigration produce and file with the Clerk of the Committee, the file respecting John McGrann and family, was agreed to.

The Committee then adjourned till Monday, May 7, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
TUESDAY, May 8, 1928.

The committee came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Brown, in the absence of Mr. Kay, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bancroft, Boys, Brown, Cahan, Carmichael, Campbell, Charters, Coote, Donnelly, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Glen, McKenzie, McPhee, Millar, Ralston, Rowe, Spence, Stewart, Totzke, Vallance.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration

The Hon. George Langley, of Regina, appeared before the committee and was examined.

It being one o'clock, the committee adjourned till four p.m.

The committee reconvened at four o'clock.

Mr. Langley was recalled, was further examined and retired.

Miss Esther Mackie, of Montreal, formerly engaged in immigration and colonization work, was called before the committee, examined and retired.

Members present: Messrs. Boulanger, Brown, Coote, Donnelly, Dubuc, Fansher, Forke, Glen, Lucas, Ralston, Stewart, Totzke, Vallance.

The committee adjourned at six o'clock p.m. till Wednesday at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, May 9, 1928.

The Committee came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Brown, in the absence of Mr. Kay, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Bancroft, Brown, Cahan, Campbell, Coote, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Garland (Carleton), Glen, Jacobs, Lucas, McMillan, McPhee, Motherwell, Ralston, Rowe, Sinclair (Wellington North), Spotton, Spence, Vallance.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Colonel T. R. Tudge of the Salvation Army was called, examined and retired.

Staff Captain Owen Culshaw of the Salvation Army was then called and was under examination at one o'clock when the committee adjourned till four p.m.

Moved by Mr. Coote that the sub-committee consider the advisability of calling Mr. Coldwell of Regina, Mr. Lynch of the Department of the Interior, Ottawa, and Superintendents of Asylums for the Insane in the several provinces, as witnesses.

Motion carried.

Mr. Edwards gave notice of motion that the committee concludes the taking of evidence this week, except as to calling witnesses from the Department of Immigration.

The committee then adjourned till four p.m.

The committee reconvened at four o'clock.

Mr. Culshaw was recalled and at six o'clock his examination not being finished he was requested to appear again to-morrow at 11 a.m.

The chairman read a telegram from the President of the United Farmers of Canada, Saskatchewan Section, submitting to the committee a resolution passed in convention, defining the attitude of the United Farmers on the immigration question.

The committee ordered that such resolution be printed in the record.

Members present at the afternoon sitting: Bancroft, Brown, Cahan, Campbell, Coote, Edwards, Forke, Glen, Lucas, McPhee, Totzke, Vallance.

The committee adjourned till 11 a.m., Thursday, May 10th.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, May 10, 1928.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Brown, Cahan, Carmichael, Charters, Donnelly, Dubuc, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Glen, Kay, McGibbon, McPhee, Maybee, Millar, Ralston, Ross, Spotton, Stirling, Vallance, Young.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Mr. Glen, chairman of the sub-committee on correspondence and witnesses, reported to the committee,

(a) that an official of the National Resources Branch of the Department of the Interior would be in attendance to give evidence on the question of available lands for settlement;

(b) that Dr. Amyot, deputy minister, and Dr. Clark, assistant deputy minister of the Department of Health, were in attendance to give evidence.

(c) that further witnesses, if so desired, should be nominated by the committee and that the sub-committee be discharged.

The report of the sub-committee was adopted.

By the consent of the committee the motion of Mr. Edwards standing on the order paper was withdrawn.

After discussion as to calling further witnesses generally and the calling of Mr. M. J. Coldwell of Regina, in particular, Mr. Carmichael moved that the committee favours the calling of Mr. Coldwell but that action in that regard be deferred till after the departmental officials had been heard.

After discussion, Mr. Cahan moved in amendment that Mr. Coldwell be summoned to attend forthwith.

The motion by Mr. Cahan by way of amendment was carried.

Mr. Millar introduced the subject of the production by him and the filing and printing in the record, of certain documents or extracts therefrom, in respect to the subject of reference,—Wheat Grading.—On motion by Mr. Vallance it was decided that Mr. Millar could only get such documents on the record as evidence by appearing as a witness before the committee and then and there producing such documents.

Mr. Culshaw was recalled, examined and retired.

Witness discharged.

Dr. Clark, assistant deputy minister, department of Health, was called and was under examination when the committee adjourned at one o'clock.

The committee reconvened at four o'clock.

Dr. Clark was called, examined and retired.

Mr. J. W. Egan, deputy minister of Immigration was then called, examined and retired.

The committee adjourned till 11 a.m., Friday, May 11th.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, May 11, 1928.

The committee came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Brown, in the absence of Mr. Kay, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bancroft, Boulanger, Brown, Carmichael, Coote, Donnelly, Dubuc, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Garland (Carleton), Glen, Lucas, McKenzie, McMillan, McPhee, Maybee, Millar, Ralston, Sinclair (Queens), Sinclair (Wellington North), Tolmie, Totzke.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Mr. Boulanger requested that a certain petition addressed to the Hon. the Minister of Justice and a memorandum submitted therewith, be referred to the committee and that the same (in abbreviated form) be printed in the record.

The committee agreed.

Mr. A. L. Jolliffe, Commissioner, Department of Immigration and Colonization, was called, examined and retired.

The chairman read to the meeting a telegram addressed to the clerk by Mr. W. J. Coldwell, who had been summoned to attend before the committee on Tuesday next.

After full discussion of the situation as developed by the reply of Mr. Coldwell, it was moved by Mr. Bancroft, seconded by Mr. Glen, that the clerk be instructed to telegraph Mr. Coldwell that his reply was not acceptable and that he would be expected to attend before the committee at a later date if so required.

Motion carried.

The committee decided to again take under consideration the subject of Wheat Grading on Monday next and the subject of Immigration on Tuesday next.

The committee then adjourned till Monday, May 14, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, May 15, 1928.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Bancroft, Brown, Cahan, Campbell, Carmichael, Charters, Coote, Donnelly, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Garland (Carleton), Glen, Kay, Lucas, McGibbon, McKenzie, McMillan, McPhee, Maybee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Rowe, Sinclair (Queens), Sinclair (Wellington North), Spence, Stewart, Stirling, Tolmie, Vallance.

The committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

The chairman directed the attention of the committee to the Minutes of Proceedings of Friday, May 11, 1928, wherein was recorded a motion that the clerk be instructed to telegraph Mr. Coldwell of Regina, that his reply to a summons to attend before the committee on Tuesday the fifteenth instant was not acceptable to the committee and that he would be expected to attend at a later date if so required.

The chairman informed the committee that the clerk had telegraphed Mr. Coldwell, pursuant to the directions of the committee as in the said motion contained and that subsequently upon instructions of the acting chairman had sent a telegram directing Mr. Coldwell to attend before the committee on Tuesday, the fifteenth instant.

The chairman stated that Mr. Coldwell was present and, in view of what had transpired, if the committee wished him to take the stand it would be necessary to adopt a motion to that effect.

Thereupon Mr. Forke moved that Mr. Coldwell be called.

Motion carried.

During the course of the examination of the witness, the witness was asked to name a certain person referred to by him in his evidence and upon the witness demurring and claiming he should be given protection before being required to answer, the chairman ruled that the committee could not limit nor extend the protection which by rule of Parliament was afforded witnesses before committees of the House; that the witness could not excuse himself from answering any proper question and that the question then put was a proper one.

It being one o'clock the committee adjourned till Wednesday, May 16th, at 11 a.m., when the witness Coldwell would appear for further examination.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
WEDNESDAY May 16, 1928.

Members present: Messrs. Anderson, Bancroft, Benoit, Boys, Brown, Cahan, Campbell, Carmichael, Coote, Donnelly, Edwards, Forke, Glen, Jacobs, Kay, Lucas, McGibbon, McKenzie, McPhee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Ross, Totzke, Vallance, Young.

The committee came to order at 11 a.m. Mr. Kay presiding.

The chairman directed the attention of the committee to the fact that the Conservative party was in caucus this morning and that the customary practice under such circumstances was for committees not to proceed to business.

After discussion the committee decided to adjourn.

Prior to adjournment Mr. Cahan moved that Hon. E. J. McMurray of Winnipeg be summoned to attend before the committee.

The committee agreed that the motion of Mr. Cahan be put and the chairman putting the question the motion carried.

The committee then adjourned till 4 p.m.

The committee re-convened at 4 o'clock, Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Boys, Brown, Campbell, Carmichael, Coote, Edwards, Fansher, Garland (Carleton), Glen, Jacobs, Kay, Lucas, McGibbon, McKenzie, McPhee, Millar, Ralston, Rowe, Sinclair (Queens), Sinclair (Wellington North), Spence, Stewart, Forke, Stirling, Totzke, Young.

By consent the Hon. Mr. Manion M.P., read a prepared statement relative to the use of his name by witness Coldwell at a previous meeting.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell was recalled, examined and retired.

Witness discharged.

Hon. Mr. Forke, Minister of the Department of Immigration and Colonization, appeared before the committee, was sworn, examined and retired.

On motion of Mr. Edwards a file of correspondence and exhibits received by the clerk from witness Owen Culshaw was ordered filed and printed on the record.

The committee adjourned sine die.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of the Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, May 18, 1928.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bancroft, Brown, Cahan, Campbell, Carmichael, Coote, Donnelly, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Garland (Carleton), Glen, Jacobs, Kay, Lucas, McKenzie, McPhee, Motherwell, Ralston, Senn, Sinclair (Wellington North), Spence, Spotton, Stewart, Totzke, Vallance, Young.

The committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Mr. Garland (Bow River) gave notice of motion that the court records of the case of Rex vs. Alexander be brought before the committee.

Mr. Cahan moved that Mr. Egan, deputy Minister of Immigration be re-called.

Motion carried.

Mr. Egan was called, examined and retired.

The chairman read a telegram from Mr. E. J. McMurray of Winnipeg, advising that he would appear before the committee on Tuesday, the 22nd instant, as required by summons duly sent him.

The committee adjourned till Tuesday, May 22nd, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, May 22, 1928.

The committee came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present:—Messrs., Bancroft, Boys, Brown, Cahan, Campbell, Coote, Donnelly, Dubuc, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Garland (Carleton), Glen, Guthrie, Jacobs, Kay, Lucas, McGibbon, McKenzie, McMillan, McPhee, Maybee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Senn, Sinclair (Queens), Sinclair (Wellington North), Spence, Spotton, Stewart, Stirling, Tolmie, Totzke, Vallance, Young.

The committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

E. J. McMURRAY was called, sworn, examined and retired.

Witness discharged.

Mr. Campbell, M.P., rose to a question of privilege in respect to a certain newspaper article wherein he was reported as having made certain statements in respect to immigration matters. Mr. Campbell stated to the committee that the article in question had mis-reported him and gave the correct version.

On motion of Mr. Boys, Mr. Campbell was then called before the committee as a witness, was sworn, examined and retired.

W. J. Egan, deputy minister of Immigration, was then called, examined and retired.

Mr. Fansher gave notice of motion that, a sub-committee to draft a report, be appointed at the next meeting of the committee.

Mr. Lucas moved, seconded by Mr. Edwards, that a Mr. Kennedy be called as a witness. Motion lost.

Mr. Fansher moved that the proper officer of the Supreme Court of Ontario be subpoenaed to attend and produce the court record and all exhibits filed in the case of Rex vs. Alexander.

Motion carried.

The committee adjourned till Wednesday, May 23, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, May 23, 1928.

The Committee came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Arthurs, Bancroft, Boulanger, Brown, Cahan, Campbell, Carmichael, Coote, Donnelly, Dubuc, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Garland (Carleton), Glen, Guthrie, Kay, Lucas, McGibbon, McMillan, Maybee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Stewart, Stirling, Tolmie, Totzke, Vallance, Young.

The Committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Discussion took place respecting editorials appearing in several newspapers, critical of the proceedings of the Committee.

Followed discussion at length respecting a telegram in the possession of and referred to by a member of the Committee, at a previous sitting.

Mr. Boys moved that S. Kolchin of Winnipeg, named in the telegram in question, be summoned to appear before the Committee.

Motion carried.

Mr. Boys moved that the person who signed the telegram in question be summoned to appear before the Committee. After discussion of the motion the same was, by consent, withdrawn.

Mr. Edwards moved that the telegram in question be produced and included in the record. After discussion the motion, by consent, was withdrawn.

Mr. Garland (Carleton) rose to a point of order, questioning the relevancy of remarks being then made by another member.

The chairman ruled that the point of order was not well taken.

Mr. Coote read a Resolution of the United Farmers of Alberta, and by the consent of the Committee, the same was read into the record.

Mr. Cahan moved that Orders in Council, P.C. 183, P.C. 642, and P.C. 534 be produced and filed.

Motion carried.

Mr. Fansher, pursuant to notice given, moved that a sub-committee be appointed to draft a report and submit same to the Committee for its consideration; the members of the said sub-committee to be as follows, namely: Messrs. Kay, Stewart, Glen, Boulanger, Donnelly, Cahan, McGibbon, Edwards, and Carmichael.

Motion carried.

The Committee then adjourned at the call of the chair.

A. A. Fraser,

Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, May 29, 1928.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Arthurs, Bancroft, Boulanger, Boys, Brown, Cahan, Campbell, Carmichael, Charters, Coote, Edwards, Forke, Garland (Bow River), Garland (Carleton), Glen, Kay, Lucas, McKenzie, McMillan, McPhee, Maybee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Sinclair, Sinclair, Stewart, Tolmie, Totzke, Vallance, Young.

The committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

The chairman read a report prepared by the clerk, in the matter of the witness S. Kolchin. The committee decided that the summons to S. Kolchin be cancelled.

The chairman then read a report from the clerk in the matter of Rex vs. Alexander when the committee decided that no further action be taken in this matter other than by filing and printing into the record the documents referred to in the said report.

W. J. Egan was then called and stated that he produced the list of names of members of Parliament and others and the numbers of letters of admittance credited to each for the period from April, 1926 to April 1928, inclusive.

Before the witness was permitted to read the said list Mr. Edwards moved that an additional list dating back to _____ be prepared by the witness. After discussion Mr. Edwards asked that the motion stand until the list now produced be read. The motion stood by consent.

Mr. Egan then read the list by him produced.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Cahan moved that the correspondence, if any, on the departmental files in the matter of S. Kolchin, be produced.

Motion carried.

The committee adjourned till 4 p.m. when Bill 188, An Act to amend the Canada Grain Act, will be considered.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, May 30, 1928.

The committee came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Bancroft, Brown, Campbell, Carmichael, Donnelly, Dubuc, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Glen, Kay, McKenzie, Maybee, Millar, Motherwell, Ralston, Sinclair, Spence, Spotton, Stewart, Stirling, Totzke, Vallance.

The committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

Mr. Edwards renewed the motion standing on the order paper, in his name, with a certain amendment thereto.

The motion as moved and now put; that the department file a list of letters of admission issued and the names of the sponsors thereto, dating back to the beginning of the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1920.

Motion carried.

W. J. Egan was again called, examined and retired.

The committee adjourned till four o'clock, p.m.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, May 30, 1928.

The committee came to order at four o'clock p.m., Mr. Kay presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Boulanger, Brown, Donnelly, Edwards, Fansher, Forke, Glen, Kay, Lucas, McPhee, Ralston, Ross, Stewart, Young.

The committee again took under consideration the subject of Immigration.

W. J. Egan was again called, examined and retired.

Witness discharged.

Mr. Glen moved that the taking of evidence be now deemed concluded and that the committee meet to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock, for discussion, in camera.

Motion carried.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, March 8, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: The reference made to us is in the following terms:—

That the Immigration Act and Regulations thereunder, and the general subject of immigration, including the work of the Department of Immigration and Colonization be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization for consideration and report.

What is your pleasure as to how we will take this reference up?

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, if I might, that while the matter of the Reference itself is very brief, the resolution, it seems to me, involves at the same time a good many phases. I understand there was something said the other day about having some sort of agenda so that members would know that on a certain day a certain subject would be coming up. There might be some phases in which one member would be interested and some phases in which another member would be interested; and it would assist the administration of the department if something like that could be arrived at. Perhaps a sub-committee, or some members of the committee, could take that up with you, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that would be a good way to proceed.

I do feel that some general intimation ought to be made to the officials of the Immigration Department as to the way in which this matter will be conducted. That is to say, we have had a certain amount of talk in the newspapers, and a little talk in the House of Commons, regarding matters affecting the Immigration Department; some suggestion of suspicion and all that sort of thing—and if this is to be conducted more or less—if I may put it without trying to use too strong a phrase—as an inquisition I think that the officials of the department ought to be told that in order that they may govern themselves accordingly. It is one thing to have officials of the department before you and ask them to co-operate with you and give the fullest suggestions in connection with matters of improvement and policy, and it is quite another thing to have them before you for the purpose of seeing whether or not they can be trapped, and whether charges can be laid against them; and it seems to me that the officials of this department should have some intimation as to whether this is more or less a round table conference, in order to ascertain what the policy and operation of the department is with the idea of improving it, if improvement is necessary; or whether, as I said before, it is an investigation into the good faith of the officials who have been running the department. I suggest that only because I think it is only fair to them. We do not have to be lawyers to know that people are not guilty until they are proved so. But, on the other hand, our sense of fair play tells us that when you ask people to disclose in the fullest possible way what their opinions and ideas are they want to know that they are going into an atmosphere of co-operation and general confidence, which I think probably does exist and will exist in connection with this committee. But I do feel that some intimation should be made to these gentlemen so that they will know exactly the atmosphere in which they find themselves. Let me

say this, that as far as I am concerned, and as far as the government is concerned, the fullest possible scope will be given. There is no idea of limiting the thing in any way, shape or form; but it is due these officials, I think that some intimation should be made in order, as I say, that they may know exactly the atmosphere in which they are placed. My own suggestion, if I may put it, would be that—

Mr. CAHAN: The honourable gentleman was not here the other day, when the concensus of the committee certainly was that we should ask the officials of the department to give us a general word picture of the organization, work and operation of the department; to state what their difficulties were so far as they found them, and to put before us a general picture of the work of immigration in all its important ramifications, and then if anyone wants to bring up later any particular matter or grievance why there would be ample opportunity to do so. But we, who are members of this committee representing the side of the House which I represent, wish to face it as a great national matter and avoid, as far as we can, the discussion of immaterial and incidental matters. I think the general concensus of everyone was that we should ask the officials to give a broad outline of their work and operation, and that after we had heard that, after the agreements and contracts had been brought down, after the instructions which were outstanding to immigration agents were brought down, then we would be able, perhaps, to proceed with a more definite agenda. But we are dealing with a national problem now. We hope to deal with it as such, and we hope to avoid anything petty. We wish to know the immigration agencies, the agreements with the railways, with the immigration associations, if there are any agreements outstanding; we wish to have a general outline of the whole system, and, after that, we can resolve upon some definite agenda.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: My honourable friend did not quite catch me. What I had in mind was whether the officials could come here feeling that they would sit in a round table conference in order to give information.

Mr. CAHAN: That is what we wish.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Not under suspicion of bad faith.

Mr. CAHAN: I have never heard any suggestion of that.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: There has been something said in the press.

Mr. CAHAN: We have no such desire.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I gathered the purport of what the Honourable Minister of National Defence intended to convey, but it strikes me that the first thing to do is to lay a foundation, as was suggested at the last meeting, to get the instructions given to the various agents of the government in whatever countries they are in. We are not in a position to estimate whether they are doing the work until we know what their instructions are, and what are the contracts with transportation companies and with various organizations engaged in immigration work. I think we can get that this morning from the deputy minister who is here. First of all, we want this general information. The officers of the department are officers of this country. We will co-operate with them, of course, and we will expect their co-operation in bringing out all the information that we can possibly get in regard to immigration work. But it seems to me that as officers of the department, it is inevitable that they should submit to questions which perhaps will look to them critical. It is not the idea of this committee, I take it, to put anybody on the rack; the idea is to get information. There should be no limit whatever to what any person on this committee may see fit to ask of the officials of the department. They are officials of the Dominion of Canada, and must give all the information required of them, and I assume, to start with, that they will be willing to do so, no matter how critical it may be.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I said that the fullest information was, of course, available. I was only talking of the officials themselves. Nobody can deny that the officials can be put on the rack and asked any question, and they must answer any question. The files of the department are wide open. I was only talking of the spirit and attitude towards the officials. There is one critical attitude that can be taken, and the committee can be as critical as it desires, and that is for the good of the country: the attitude that the department have been wrong in this connection, or that this or that is a wrong interpretation of the law, or something like that. Then there is criticism on the ground of bad faith and things of that sort.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, that is alright.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I take it that there is no suggestion of bad faith, but that we are to get information for the improvement of the policy and administration of the department. I think that that information is due to the officials more for the reason, as my honourable friend, Dr. Edwards says, that they must answer any questions put to them. They cannot plead privilege and things of that sort, but I think the committee should be careful to establish an atmosphere which would bring with it the very best results.

Mr. McGIBBON: It strikes me that this is a rather peculiar introduction of this subject. Surely the minister is not trying to suggest that this committee is prejudicial to the officials, or anything of the kind. I do not know why he makes such a statement.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Because in the House and in the country the word "suspicion" has been constantly used.

Mr. McGIBBON: We are not responsible for the newspapers.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: It is not only the newspapers, but in the House as well.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I do not intend to take any prominent part in this unless I have to. But I want to say that as far as I am personally concerned, I will do everything I can to facilitate the work of the committee and give it all the information that is possible. Personally, I am as much interested as any member of this committee with regard to criticisms. Some of them in the House have been perfectly legitimate and alright. I can take my medicine. Some of them have not been very kind sometimes, but they have not hurt very much. After all, I have nothing to hide; bring it all out.

Mr. McGIBBON: It goes with the job.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: But I do hope that when this committee ends its deliberations they will be able to give me some concrete advice that will help me in administering the department of Immigration and Colonization. I want to tell you gentlemen that there has not been a speech made in the House of Commons that I have not watched for some constructive thought, that would help me in my work. Now, I do not want to speak in a derogatory sense, but I haven't got any.

W. J. EGAN, Deputy Minister of Immigration, called and sworn:—

Mr. CAHAN: I would suggest that Mr. Egan be asked to give us a general statement of the organization and operation of the Immigration department in about the same spirit as he would give it to a new minister coming in, who knew nothing about the department at all, and did not know what the general machinery and operations of the department are.

WITNESS: This is a fairly large order. I just don't know how quite to approach the proposition as suggested. I feel that I should not in any way assert a policy; I think that a declaration of policy should come from the minister. If I am allowed to pass over the policy proposition, then I can review the work of the department, and perhaps start in with British immigration. Out-

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

side of general policy, but more or less connected with it, our work, owing to the conditions that prevail both on the Continent and here—on the Continent it was an after-war effect, and it was to some extent here—our work was entirely directional. That is the only part I will touch on policy.

MR. CAHAN: Give us a statement of the organization of your department here, and then of your general organization as it extends into Great Britain, as it extends in the United States and other countries, so that we may see what the machinery of the department is.

WITNESS: Just in a general way? You do not expect me to get down to the actual details in each branch of service?

MR. CAHAN: No, we want a general view of the whole organization.

HON. MR. STEWART: Just take your Canadian organization, Mr. Egan, and then go into the United States and Britain.

HON. MR. FORKE: Begin with the organization down at the Jackson Building and work out from that.

WITNESS: Our organization in the department of Immigration has its headquarters here in Ottawa. The organization here is for the purpose, naturally, of conducting and carrying out the policy of the government in connection with immigration. We have under our immediate supervision here for the work a commissioner of colonization, a commissioner of immigration, and three divisional commissioners throughout Canada, each handling a section of Canada in-as-far as the administration of the Act is concerned.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Will you name those three commissioners, and the sections they operate in?—A. Yes. Commissioner Fraser for the Eastern division; Commissioner Jolliffe, for the Western division; and Commissioner Skinner, for the Pacific division.

Q. Which is the Eastern division; how far does it go?—A. I would have to refer to documents to give you the exact line. It is just this side of Winnipeg. The Western division works from that immediate point east of Winnipeg to a few miles inside of British Columbia. The Pacific division works from that particular point to the coast.

By Mr. Totzke:

Q. Where are these commissioners situated?—A. In Ottawa, Winnipeg and Vancouver. At headquarters here we have the Commissioner of Immigration and the Commissioner of Colonization. We have the superintendent of the Women's Branch and the superintendent of the Juvenile branch. The Commissioner of Immigration has the supervision of the three divisional commissioners; he checks up their particular work in-as-far as the Act requires. The superintendent of the Women's branch has in her care the placement of women coming under our direction for domestic service.

HON. MR. STEWART: Give her name.

The WITNESS: Miss Burnham, and Mr. Smart is the superintendent of the Juvenile branch. The superintendent of juvenile immigration has the whole of that work under his care with, of course, a number of inspectors who make their regular visits, of inquiry in connection with juveniles who have been placed in the country. As far as we are concerned in a general way, in Canada within the last four years, realizing that the Soldiers' Settlement Board had within its body men of experience who could do a certain work, more particularly in connection with directional work, and has a land settlement branch—part of their work is in connection with the possibilities of settling the people in their particular areas as well as the after care in seeing that they are placed if they are out of work—British immigrants who come under the assisted passage. There is so much to speak of that one does not know where to stop or begin in connection

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

with the work here. So many people forget, when speaking of the Immigration department and its cost, that we have our far-flung borders, from coast to coast, our immigration officials who, naturally, are there, in a great measure, for the prevention of illegal entry, and have nothing to do whatsoever with the expense of encouraging immigration or the placing of immigrants.

Then, of course there are the ports for the receiving of the people at Halifax, St. John, Quebec city, Montreal to some extent, and the Pacific division so far as the seaports are concerned.

Arising from our work here, we carry on also the supervision of our American work from Ottawa. We have in the United States some seventeen offices divided into as many districts. This work is carried on in a very thorough way, and is supervised by Mr. W. R. Little, who superintends the American field as well as acting as commissioner of Colonization here. We make regular visits of inspection to our offices and supervise their work and the distribution of literature. Our officers are not known as immigration agents, but are "information Bureaus" in the United States.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Does Mr. Little communicate with the seventeen agencies that you have in the United States, or have you one man over these seventeen in the United States?—A. No, he communicates with them and visits them regularly.

Q. Each one?—A. Yes, each one; some not so often as others. Then, they have a conference once a year, a meeting of the officers from Headquarters as well as Mr. Little.

Q. Will you place in the hands of the committee, a little later on, the divisions in the United States, where they are located, and the names of the men who are engaged there, please?—A. Yes, gladly, sir.

(See productions at page 738 post.)

Q. You can hand that in any time this week?—A. Yes, sir. Our work in the United States is naturally a different work to what it is in other fields. We carry on not so much with lectures, but with inquiries. We carry on a very big advertizing campaign and our follow-up system is as thorough as we know how to make it. We can tell you the prospective immigrant in any given district. And there are times that prospective immigrants are interviewed, far beyond the results of advertizing and publicity of any kind. We have our officers make a canvass of the possibilities in that immediate environment for people moving into Canada, and we follow them up with publicity, both direct and indirect. I might cover it in that very short way and then go to the United Kingdom.

In the United Kingdom we have altogether twenty-one officers. I have a little review here. As far as the United Kingdom is concerned there are ten agencies in the British Isles for the sole purpose of obtaining British immigrants. Competent agents are in charge of these offices. They are all Canadians now. In eight of the offices we have, in addition to the agents, Grade No. 1, or assistant agents. Attached to these agencies we, also, have eight women officers whose duty it is to interview and select suitable household workers for employment in Canada. We have, therefore, approximately 30 officers of Canadian training who are competent to interview and select immigrants who receive the reduced passage rates, and who are coming to Canada under the Empire Settlement Scheme. Our total organization in the United Kingdom comprises 137 officials.

We advertise in the United Kingdom in 453 news-papers and journals; that is in Great Britain and Ireland.

In regard to Exhibitions, last year Emigration agents attended 108 agricultural shows. At these exhibitions Canadian agricultural products were displayed and over 250,000 pieces of literature were distributed.

We have motor vans in the British Isles. During the year, the officials in charge of the motor vans distributed over 78,000 pieces of literature; there we

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

specialize wherever possible with school children of fairly good age, so that they may become interested in our literature. Our officers delivered lectures last year in the smaller towns and villages in good agricultural districts in the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland. They gave 244 lectures. Lantern slides are used by the agents at these lectures. We distributed all told in the old country over a half million pieces of literature. Last year alone, outside of our advertising, we secured, either direct or indirect, for publicity purposes space for 1,354 items.

In connection with our work in the old country a great deal of time was devoted to the selection of 3,000 families under what is called the "3,000 Family Scheme". Would you like the details as to what that scheme is? The Canadian government provided the farms with suitable buildings at reasonable cost and the British government advanced \$1,500 for stock and equipment. This scheme expired on the 1st of July last year; but not having been completed as to the full 3,000 families it has been renewed, and we are carrying on this year.

Part of our work in the old country is securing farm laborers as well as domestic servants, and in that connection the Oversea Settlement Department of the British government have co-operated in various schemes of assisted passage. I have information in connection with that, but I presume it is better to have it brought out on any questions that may be asked of officials.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. In connection with the 3,000 family scheme, does the Canadian government become responsible for the repayment of any of this loan by the British government?—A. Yes, the Canadian government undertook collection of that loan of \$1,500 after these people are under way.

Q. I asked if the Canadian government became responsible for the repayment of this money?—A. Not responsible in any way. They undertook the collection only.

HON. MR. FORKE: Don't they share fifty-fifty of the loss?

THE WITNESS: Should any loss occur in connection with these advances—for instance, the \$1,500 may go for stock and equipment and there may be a little loss in four years—the British and Canadian governments share fifty-fifty per cent on those losses, should they occur.

MR. CAHAN: Can you tell us what other agencies and associations co-operate with the Immigration department in England? Is there any relation to the Salvation Army; or any relation to the Barnado children scheme; or any relation to any other agency or association?

HON. MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that if my honourable friend will allow Mr. Egan to finish, then we can deal with all these agencies.

THE WITNESS: Would you care to have the details in connection with the Empire Settlement Scheme. It is pretty well known to every gentleman in the room, but would you like to have it reviewed?

MR. GARLAND (Bow River): I suggest that you complete the organization first.

THE WITNESS: On the continent we have a number of officers situated, at Rotterdam, at Paris...

HON. MR. FORKE: You did not explain about Mr. Bruce Walker being the head of the whole thing.

THE WITNESS: No, I did not. In connection with the old country agencies, Mr. Bruce Walker is the director of all overseas work with Headquarters in London. All of these officers that I mention are, of course, under his immediate supervision. We have also an assistant to the director, and included in the 137. Out of that number is the Headquarters staff at London. Mr. Bruce Walker supervises and superintends the work of these men, and travels from post to

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

post. We have inaugurated, in reference to these offices within the last few years, a system which gives us perfect control, as far as an inquiry from any individual who may be interested in the possibilities of moving to this country is concerned, and we have our follow-up system and our check-back books of the system if the immigrant has made up his mind not to come. We would be glad to go into details and show how an effort is made to secure from the old country as many immigrants as we possibly can.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Would you also, Mr. Egan, at your convenience—not necessarily now—give us the names and locations of those agencies in the United Kingdom?—

A. In the United Kingdom and on the continent too? (*See productions at page 739 post*).

Q. And on the continent?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Totzké:

Q. Are the medical examiners included in this list?—A. No, entirely outside. At a certain season of the year, Soldiers' Settlement men go over in connection with the selection of families and the final test of the families for settlement here, for the last four or five years. As far as the continent is concerned, one hears a great deal about what we should do in the type of propaganda in certain countries. As a matter of fact, there is only one country on the whole continent, Holland, where we are allowed to carry on propaganda. I started to name the various agencies. There is Paris, Rotterdam, Riga, Danzig, Antwerp, and one other which I forget for the moment. We keep a complete record of all immigrants and the amount of money they are carrying, and the country of origin. We do not carry on general publicity there. The purpose of our officers is to visa the passports of the incoming immigrants from the continent. They must be coming in under certain conditions of employment and labour that have been approved of.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Would your instructions to the agents on the continent be identical with those given to the agencies in the United Kingdom?—A. No, they are different entirely.

Q. I would ask also that the instructions to the United States and the agents in the various countries be also put in the record.—A. (*See Productions at page 748 post*). There are non-preferred countries and preferred countries. Arising out of the decision of the government some six years ago, an order in council was passed which permitted only those of the agricultural type to come from anywhere on the continent. In a very short time, through the request of certain interests it was felt (it was never made public that one was called a preferred country and another was called a non-preferred country) it was more or less understood between the parties who were interested in the emigration of people from the continent, that particular Order in Council which required people of the agricultural type only, to come from the continent was more or less inoperative for the time being in-so-far as Holland, Belgium, France and Switzerland were concerned; also the Scandinavian countries. Within the last year and a half Germany has been brought in. Any man coming from these countries may come into the country if he is mentally and physically fit and able to look after himself. We have as near as possible the open door. Below the German line on the continent are what is termed the non-preferred countries. We have no agent in the interior; our agents are at the ports only for the purpose of vising the documents and examining the man before he leaves that section of Europe to come to Canada. We carry on no propaganda in those countries.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Are those discriminations made by Order in Council or by departmental instructions?—A. That is as to the dropping of certain countries?

Q. Yes?—A. Not by Order in Council; no.

Q. Would you please give us copies of the instructions in that respect?—A. Yes, I would be glad to. It was with the Canadian interests, the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway, that we worked out the proposition termed the non-preferred countries, not including Italy. Italy is not in the railway agreement. We are co-operating with the railways for the securing of emigrants for farm placement here, the undertaking of the railways being to recruit the suitable type, and place them at agricultural work in Canada.

Q. Would you please give us copies of the agreements which you have with the railways?—A. Yes, I would be glad to. I presume that the agreement for this year is quite sufficient?

Q. I suppose it is the same as last year?—A. No, it is not.

Q. Perhaps we might have both?—A. Yes. (*See Productions at page 732 post.*) This year's agreement with the railways is different in this respect, that the previous agreement allowed the railways to function for government in-as-far as type was concerned. The emigrants were recruited by them and not by any booking agent or anything of that kind. They, the Railways, appointed a man with Canadian experience responsible to the president of his railway for this particular work. So they were the Railway selection officers, and having selected a type they gave him a certificate which up to this year was a warrant without question that this man was of the physical type with the natural farming ability and experience to do farming in this country. This year that does not exist. He is recruited as yet by the railway representative in a particular country and brought forward and checked by our officer this year as to his suitability for that particular work here. That is the difference between last year's agreement and that of this year.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: One of the members of the committee mentioned medical examiners and asked if they were included in that organization. I do not know whether that comes in appropriately or not. I think you had better explain your organization with regard to medical inspection.

The WITNESS: I am afraid I have come entirely unprepared from the point of view of expounding in detail. I did not know what was required of me to-day, and I am afraid I have only covered the matter in a very very general way. If I may, I would suggest an open meeting; questions asked will bring you more details, after I have covered all this information, and perhaps give me some angles to start out on.

Mr. CAHAN: You are doing well.

The WITNESS: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: The railways are still bound to select the same type. Our officer looks them over.

The WITNESS: I thought, perhaps, I would leave that until we give them copies. That is what I had in the back of my mind when I was covering that. I have just gone over our organization as it exists as far as its far-flung points are concerned.

Mr. GERVAIS: Has the department an organization in the United States?

The WITNESS: Yes, I covered that in the earlier part of my talk. We have seventeen different agencies in the United States. This year more particularly; in fact, entirely as far as the medical examination is concerned, it all came about on account of the Empire Settlement assisted passage. We used over there the roster doctors, and the department of Health sent over two doctors to check the work of the roster doctors—in their medical examinations.

Each year since I have been in charge of the department, and previously, there has been considerable and continued pressure from many interests in Canada for medical examination. One of the strongest reasons was that rather than turn people back from the ports of entry in Canada it would be much better that they should be examined on the continent, at the continental ports and within the United Kingdom; and that was established this year—the medical services in co-operation, of course, with the department of Health.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: If I may interrupt, I think you ought to make one point clear to the committee. You spoke of the medical health organization as though it were part of your organization. I think you should make it clear that it is a different organization over which you have no control. Explain to the committee the difference between the Health department and your department.

The WITNESS: In answer to the request in reference to the department of Health, perhaps I had better cover that. It is clearly and distinctly understood that we have no control over the medical services or over their work; that is entirely with the department of Health of Canada. Here are some of the reasons which brought about the necessity for the medical examination. At the Federal-Provincial Immigration Conference of November, 1923, more careful medical inspection and the desirability of doing this prior to sailing, was repeatedly stressed by Provincial delegates. May I say that that conference took place five months after I took charge of the department. I was particularly impressed with what the representative of each province throughout Canada had to tell me in connection with their provincial public charges as a result of people not being healthy, and who had left either the old country or the continent and had settled in their various provinces. This is covered by this note from the various provinces from time to time, complaining that the cost of maintenance of those who, after being admitted to Canada as immigrants, later became charges in provincial institutions for causes existent at the time of entry. Similar complaints have been received from many municipalities and from hospitals.

A resolution was passed at the Social Service Council of the Church of England in November, 1922, urging inspection overseas. Similar action has been taken by other Social Service agencies.

The Hamilton Chamber of Commerce, in July, 1925, passed a resolution calling for medical inspection prior to sailing.

The Native Sons of Canada and Canadian Daughters' Leagues, two years ago, adopted a similar resolution.

The Province of Quebec, by order in council of April, 1927, approved of a resolution adopted by the Dominion Council of Health, which calls for the medical examination of all immigrants prior to sailing.

An appeal was received from the Nova Scotia government in November, 1926, asking for examination prior to sailing.

Editorials have appeared from time to time in leading Canadian papers strongly recommending inspection abroad. The Canadian Council of Agriculture, which is affiliated with the United Farmers of Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec, the United Grain Growers, Limited, and the Grain Growers' Guide, wrote in October last.

The Canadian Council of Agriculture then goes on with the details, and so on. I could give you many other resolutions; these are not all we have by any means.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. When was the medical inspection adopted?—A. The first of February, 1928.

Q. Have you in your hands the names of the doctors?—A. No, that is under the Department of Health.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Have you the instructions issued to them?—A. No; that would be entirely under the Department of Health.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Who is the executive—not the political executive?—A. Doctor Amyot, the Deputy Minister.

Q. Residing in Ottawa?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Anderson (Halton):

Q. May I ask if the Department of Immigration is not responsible for the acceptance of these doctors?—A. Not in any shape, form or manner, sir.

Q. You have nothing whatever to do with that?—A. No, nothing whatever.

Q. Nor with the origination of the policy?—A. Not with the origination of the policy. The first call for medical inspection was when we assumed the liability in connection with assisted passages; we wanted to make sure that the people who were securing assisted passages were in the best of health. It was then the examination regarding health was inaugurated. Many bodies have been memorializing us for years in regard to the medical inspection; I have only quoted a very few.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. The appropriation for the payment of these doctors comes under—A. The Department of Health.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Do I understand that no responsible official of the government is responsible for the policies laid down in this examination? Is it left to deputy ministers and ministers who are not responsible to parliament or anybody else?—A. No, of course not. The deputy ministers consult with their ministers. As a matter of fact, at the conference in connection with it, both the Minister of Immigration and the Minister of Health attended when we were discussing the whole proposition—on more than one occasion.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Who would be responsible for making out the schedule? I think that is what Dr. McGibbons means. Who would be responsible for making out the schedule which has to be filled in by the intending immigrant?—A. There is no schedule filled out by the intending immigrant as far as health is concerned, in any shape, form or manner.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. There must be some instructions laid down to those medical men.—A. Yes.

Q. Who is responsible for those?—A. The Minister of Health, of course, working in co-operation with us. We have one of our officers now on the other side. Having heard so many stories as to how it was not working, we have one of our own officers there. We believe that the Department of Health has worked out a very fine system, and one that will work to the best advantage of everybody, but we wanted to make doubly sure, and we sent one of our officers there to check up and report to us.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Brown:

Q. You say that no immigrant will fill out a schedule of questions?—A. Not as regarding medical questions.

Q. It has been stated some 90 questions had to be answered.—A. That I do not know. That is romance to me, so far. The Department of Health might be able to answer that.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: It is in regard to those people seeking assisted passage.

The WITNESS: Ah, yes; that has nothing to do with his health.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. There is no one paper which asks so many questions. There are three sets of papers for different individuals coming under different schemes, and if you multiply them all together you will get approximately that number, but no one man has to fill out anything like that number?—A. I was covering it entirely from the Health point of view.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. May we have a copy of the instructions issued to the medical men?—A. I have no authority over that, but I presume the Department of Health will be glad to let you have it. We can give you copies of instructions to our officials in regard to certain examinations.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. We will have the officers of the Department of Health here, and they may be examined?—A. I have covered this, I know, in a very inadequate and poor way. I am not in very good shape, as I have been suffering from a severe cold—

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. While we are on the matter of health: you mentioned the roster doctors, and then went on to describe what the situation is now. What do you mean by a "roster doctor?" What do they do? By whom are they instructed? If any change was made, what was that change? The roster doctors were British doctors?—A. Yes, British registered doctors organized by the Old Country government in connection with some of their requirements. They were first recognized by Australia and New Zealand in connection with immigrants going to those countries. It is a body organized in the Old Country in connection with some of their particular insurance and other requirements of the Old Country laws. When we saw the necessity for a medical examination, we selected a certain number of doctors out of this roster doctor program to make the medical examinations required in connection with all receiving assisted passage to Canada—either loan or assisted passage, according to the various phases it went through from the beginning of the Empire settlement. These doctors are now only used in a limited way, in outlying places, to save the people having to travel too far. I would much prefer to have the Department of Health tell you, in connection with their system and their organization, what it means. I may tell you offhand that all this story about loss of days is not a fact. There are few who have to travel more than six to ten miles, and outside of that distance we work with the roster doctors in certain districts to prevent the difficulties which some people said existed.

Q. The Act which you administer provides for certain physical requirements?—A. Yes.

Q. And says that a person shall not be physically defective, and shall not have tuberculosis and certain contagious diseases?—A. Yes.

Q. It is the examination for those which is handed over by you to the Department of Health?—A. Yes. Before our medical officers were appointed overseas that examination took place at the port of debarkation, and very often

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

caused a great deal of inconvenience and suffering to people who had to return. I much prefer to have the Department of Health explain what the percentage of rejections was.

Q. Your department is the one which has to say whether the people are physically fit, under the Act, and in order to make certain about that you asked the duty to be performed by the Department of Health?—A. Yes. In the past it has been performed at the port of entry, but is now undertaken by the doctors in the Old Country.

Q. Was it done then by the Department of Health?—A. Yes, at Quebec Halifax and St. John.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Part of that work is still being done by the roster doctors?—A. Only in remote districts.

Q. You said over six to eight miles?—A. I said that the examination by an actual Canadian doctor very seldom means more than six to ten miles' travel for anybody. When it is beyond that point the Medical Department have arranged with the roster doctors in certain districts to make the examinations at a special fee for the benefit of the people who desire to emigrate. The Department of Health will explain that more in detail.

Q. That means they are still doing a large portion of the work?—A. No sir, not a large portion, but a very limited portion.

Q. I cannot reconcile those two statements.—A. Perhaps you will, if I point this out; there are 334 places of examination by these eighteen Canadian doctors in the British Isles, which are visited regularly by these doctors.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Mr. Egan, I think you might make it a little plainer if it is understood that the immigrant is never landed until he is landed on Canadian soil, and all these examinations on the other side are really for the protection of the immigrant, so that he will not come across the ocean and be sent back. That is the point of all these examinations. I do not like to interfere—

Mr. CAHAN: You will be given ample opportunity to make a statement, later.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I do not like to see a point missed.

Mr. CAHAN: We will not miss many points before we are through.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Before leaving that subject, what arrangement is made for the examination of immigrants who are not assisted in any way?—A. Every immigrant must be examined before being admitted to Canada.

Q. Where?—A. In the British Isles—in one of these 334 places.

By Mr. Anderson (Halton):

Q. Are they re-examined in Canada?—A. I understand there will be a cursory examination. The Department of Health will be glad to explain that to you in detail. I have covered my submission to you in a very, very brief way, but I am prepared to answer any questions which you may put to me.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Mr. Egan, if you have finished that, in order that we may understand your relations with other agencies, would you please state any associations, such as the Salvation Army and others, with whom you have relationship in the matter of immigration?—A. Our annual report will practically give you all the details in that respect. (*Report to be distributed to the members of the Committee.*)

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

MR. EDWARDS (Frontenac): If Mr. Cahan will permit me I would like to ask one question.

MR. CAHAN: Certainly.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Mr. Egan, suppose you get an inquiry in the United States from a person who wants to come to Canada; what is your procedure with regard to that person? He makes his application to one of our agents?—A. Yes; it may come in answer to an advertisement.

Q. Will you follow that fellow across to this side? What is done with him? Supposing, for instance, he said he wanted to go to Manitoba?—A. If he expressed a desire, or an interest, in Manitoba with our agent, our agent would immediately make arrangements with him in connection with the time best for him to move, and would give him what is called by us a "directional certificate", which is a linen-backed proposition, and would direct him to an officer of the Land Settlement Branch, with whom he would advise in connection with placement. We would give him some information. If he had already spoken of Manitoba, the chances are ten to one he would speak of some given district. He may have come to us because a neighbour, already settled in Manitoba in a given district, had written to him, and he may have all the information he requires in that respect; but for guidance on the way in, we give him this particular certificate, which lands him in this district. Then he comes under the care of our officers, who are prepared to help him in every way they can.

Q. That is, when he gets to the border he has the privilege of meeting with your officer at, say, Winnipeg or Toronto, and having the benefit of his advice?—A. Exactly.

Q. That is as far as you go with him?—A. Yes—Oh, we will go farther with him; it depends on what he wants afterwards. Our officer will report back the result of the interview, and what he has done with him, and where he has been located.

Q. Let us say a man at Winnipeg, for instance, has signified a desire to go on the land in Manitoba: your officers take him and place him?—A. If he comes to them, yes.

Q. You place him on the land?—A. It often happens that we do. We submit to him that some given district has some certain possibilities, and he comes to us in connection with them, and we are glad to advise him that we believe he can do very well under these circumstances. But we find that the average man coming up from the United States has some forerunner idea of what will satisfy him best in any given district in the western country, and outside of that we go into this directional work as to how he may best handle his household effects, and so forth. There is not very much to it, but we often have to, and do, direct him to the actual land. Then, of course, the report comes back to us as to his placement, and where he is placed through the Land Settlement Branch.

Q. Do your records contain any information as to how many have come from the United States to Canada?—A. Yes.

Q. And have been placed in each province—on the land and otherwise?—A. That I do not know; no, not "otherwise"; only on the land. Our records show their desire for land placement, but as to the actual placements, or whether they are there at the moment, we do not know.

Q. Do your records show the desire for placement in each province?—A. That I cannot answer at the moment; I will have to look it up. Mr. Blair, do you remember off-hand whether we record that in that way?

MR. BLAIR: We have the record of their declared destinations, taken at the border first; then we have the record in the Land Settlement Branch of those actually located.

The WITNESS: We have not compiled any statistics as to their placements.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Supposing a man comes in and simply says, "I want to go to Canada"; what directions do you give him as to where he shall go, and how he shall be placed?—A. What direction will our agent give him?

Q. Yes.—A. Our agent will first of all sit in with him to find out what he has been doing in the past, and what kind of farming he has been carrying on; how much money he has in hand, and get an idea of what he would like to do in Canada; find out if he has any of our literature of Canada, and so forth. It will depend entirely on the man's development and frame of mind and knowledge of Canada what the procedure be from then on. If he is very indefinite, we will give him a certain amount of literature, such as the atlases of western and eastern Canada, and will leave those with him to read, and we give him certain pamphlets. Once he has expressed a wish to go in a certain way, then we let him go through with it.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Is there any medical examination in regard to the Americans coming in?—A. No, sir, there is not.

By Mr. Brown (Lisgar):

Q. In regard to the man in the United States who might want to come to Canada, and who knew perfectly well where he wanted to go, and what he wanted to do, is there any supervision, or restriction, imposed upon him, apart from coming in contact with your agents?—A. No restriction whatsoever.

Q. No supervision, unless they ask for it?—A. Oh, no.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. How does that apply to those from the United Kingdom? Supposing a man over there is willing to pay his own way to come across here; how do you distinguish him from the ordinary passenger?—A. He is distinguished by his declaration, as to whether he is coming to remain in Canada, when he would be an immigrant, or if he is a tourist. It is a different proposition.

Q. They all have to make a declaration?—A. Oh, yes.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I want to thank Mr. Cahan for allowing me to interrupt.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. I renew my question. I would like to know the relations of the Immigration Department with the various agencies that are spoken of in the press, such as the Barnardo Home, the Salvation Army. I would like to know whether there are contracts with them. If so, I would like a general explanation of the situation, and then have the contracts produced. (*See Production at page 754 post*).—A. May I make a very short general explanation?

Q. Certainly.—A. And following your suggestion we shall submit to you a full list of the names, and just what our work is. We have relations with various interests in juvenile immigration, of which there is a full list in the Annual Report. We have relations with the two national railways, in connection with immigration from the United Kingdom, in so far as experienced and inexperienced farm settlers are concerned. Then, we have relationships with such bodies as the Church of England, the Continuing Presbyterian Church, the United Church, and other churches. Our relationship with them is to co-operate fully so that they may carry out their particular work in settlement, for their particular purpose in this country. We lend our aid in every way we possibly can. We co-operate after they have made their selection, as to the assisted passage. We have had a great deal more desire on account of the cheaper transportation, the assisted passage, than we had in the past. I would be glad to submit a full list to you of just what it means in each case.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. And in so far as you have any contractual relations with them, I would like the contract?—A. We have no contracts with any of them that I know of; it is more of an arrangement and understanding.

Q. An arrangement of what kind?—A. It is not really a contract with the railway; it is an understanding, and written instructions that they may go so far, and do so much, et cetera. They have not undertaken to do so much here at this particular end, and so on. I would be very glad to submit all of this to you.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: It is really a letter between myself and the President of the C.P.R.

The WITNESS: That is with regard to the Continent, sir; we are dealing with England.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Do these various agencies, to which you have referred, and with which you have no contractual relation, come in under your settlement scheme, or are they confined to that exclusively; or does it relate also to general immigration, outside of the assisted passage?—A. I have yet to find that they are interested in anything but assisted passage. They do not, in any way, come in under the Three Thousand Family Settlement Scheme, nor do I see any possibility of their entering. Their work is generally—if I may presume to say so—on behalf of their respective churches. I have talked with them about it—the carrying on of selective immigration for the bettering of their own forces within Canada. That is the sum and substance of their arrangement. They ask us to co-operate with them and help them to select, and we do assist where we are satisfied with the people they nominate to come in under this scheme.

Q. Does the matter of assisted passage refer exclusively, in all your operations, to those who are coming in for land settlement, as farmers, farm labourers, or domestic servants?—A. Entirely, sir; nothing else.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Have you any sort of an arrangement with the Scottish Immigrant Aid Society?—A. That is one of the institutions, yes, sir.

Q. Will you see that the contracts, or whatever papers you have in connection with that, are brought down?—A. Yes, sir. (*See Productions at page post.*)

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Will you explain to the Committee just what is involved in the reduced passages, to whom it applies, to what class of people it applies, and how they come to Canada?—A. (*Reads*):

Reduced rates for British Immigrants

Migrants from the United Kingdom, who are household workers, or who are coming to Canada to earn their livelihood on the land, are now given the following reduced rates to the points mentioned:—

Halifax, St. John or Quebec..	£2	0s.
Montreal..	3	0
Toronto..	3	10
Winnipeg..	4	10
Regina, Moose Jaw and Saskatoon..	5	0
Calgary or Edmonton..	8	10
Vancouver..	8	0

This agreement is in effect for two years, and expires on the 31st December, 1928.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Under the Assisted Passage Agreement the Department of Immigration

(a) Recruits and selects immigrants; (b) collects loans which may be advanced when necessary to families and household workers;

I may say, in connection with this low rate, that we make no loans now, except in exceptional cases. We will assume that a really genuine domestic servant is going to Regina, and has not got the £5. She is thoroughly sound in every way, but she has only got £3. We loan her the £2 to help her to come. Or perhaps a family cannot pay the full fare for their adults over seventeen. We will help them if they have not got sufficient money, rather than take that which might inconvenience them, as far as their actual settlement is concerned. We then collect it from them. That is on a fifty-fifty basis with the Old Country government, both on the loan and on the collection.

(c) Receives and finds placement on the land for migrants;

(d) Makes adequate arrangements for household workers to be personally conducted on out-going vessels, to be met on arrival by women officers, and to find them suitable employment. Apart from the agreement, the Department of Immigration also provides accommodation at government hostels or institutions, where the Department defrays the cost of from 24-28 hours board and lodging.

(e) Guarantees employment for household workers at standard wages.

The Dominion Government, in the first instance, makes all grants and loans under the said scheme, but receives from the British government a refund of grants on a fifty-fifty basis, as well as the sum which the British government has agreed to pay on account of the reduced rate. The allocation of expenditure under the reduced rate is as follows:—

Department of Immigration..	£3.10.0
Steamship Companies..	4. 0 0
	<hr/>
	£7.10.0
British Government..	7.10.0
	<hr/>
	£15. 0 0

The Department has undertaken to give aftercare for a period of five years. The average of this expenditure is estimated at £6 per head. The British government agreed to equate in cash against this expenditure an estimated average of £6. It is, therefore, the equation in cash by the British government on account of aftercare which has reduced the rate to £2.

Aftercare is defined as follows:—

(a) Securing employment for the migrants and directing to destination;

(b) visiting the migrant during the first year, and at least annually thereafter, for a period of five years from the date of settlement;

(c) hearing and dealing with any complaints regarding wages or treatment;

(d) investigating grievances and, where necessary, finding alternative employment;

(e) "Developing" the migrant, with a view to his subsequent settlement on a farm.

Under the Assisted Passage Agreement, assistance is given towards the cost of passages to persons, male and female, provided that they are:—

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

(a) Accompanied overseas, in the case of married men, by their wives and children; and, in the case of widowers or widows, by their children;

(b) have been nominated by the Dominion Government, or its agents, or by British subjects resident in Canada;

(c) have been nominated by any Provincial Government in Canada, or its agents, or by any organization approved for this purpose who have entered into an agreement;

(d) are migrating to settle upon the land, or are women approved as household workers;

(e) Have been otherwise approved as suitable settlers before sailing by Secretary of State, acting through a representative of the Oversea Settlement Committee.

Where considered necessary and advisable, loans, to be shared equally by the British government and the Dominion government, may be made to the migrant in the following cases:—

(a) Migrants accepted under any Family Settlement Scheme, and families proceeding under this agreement, a loan up to the amount payable by the migrant;

(b) household workers—a loan up to the amount of the difference between the minimum ocean rate and the migrant's contribution to the ultimate destination prescribed in this schedule, provided that such loan shall not exceed £6;

Children. For children the assistance takes the form of a free grant of the total cost of transportation, provided that:—

(1) They have not reached their seventeenth birthday before the first day of April of the financial year in which they sailed.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Is there any minimum age in regard to juvenile immigration?—A. The maximum is seventeen years. There is no minimum, if they are coming with the families.

Q. If they are not?—A. Yes, there is.

Q. What is it?—A. A minimum of fourteen years. We do not accept them under fourteen years; fourteen to seventeen.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: We do not pay the grant.

The WITNESS: That is what I mean. This grant, that I am speaking of, is not applicable to those under fourteen years.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Perhaps I do not make myself clear? In regard to juvenile immigration, there are organizations, like the British Immigration Colonization Organization, bringing boys out?—A. Yes.

Q. Is there any minimum age for such a class of immigration?—A. Fourteen, sir; from fourteen up.

Q. Then, children under fourteen cannot come to this country?—A. No, unless they are coming with their parents.

Q. How long has that been in effect?—A. Just about three years.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. What was the object of introducing that regulation?—A. The reason for introducing it was owing to the very strong propoganda in Canada from many social interests. The second reason was the Margaret Bondfield Report, in connection with children under fourteen years.

Q. That does not give the reason, that only gives the cause.—A. I would be very glad to secure the Maragaret Bondfield Report and quote to you that

particular section, and the decision of the Government. As a matter of fact, there were a great many details in connection with it, and quite a number of discussions at the time. This was three years ago, but I would be very glad to go over it, in answer to this, at any time you wish later on.

Q. Surely the Department has some idea as to why they exclude these children, other than the fact that it was asked for? It must have been asked for on certain grounds?—A. You are asking me the reason. I would ask your indulgence to allow me to submit it to you in writing, just why the decision was made. In the rough, without dotting the I's and placing the commas, it was because the children were being exploited in a general way. It was because they were not as happy under fourteen, as they were over fourteen. That, in a general way, was the reason.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. It was because of the contents of the Margaret Bondfield report?—A. That is what brought it about in a general way. We had, of course, from what had been submitted to us in Canada, been considering what we might do. Could we exact a closer examination of the children? Could we establish a certain number of children placed under our own supervision and the societies' prospective placement of children? We had been discussing it from many angles. You are asking me to go back three years. Actually, in the final result, it was this report from the mother, so to speak, of the British children, which brought about our decision; there is no question about that.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Is it not a fact, that the full passage applies only to between the ages of fourteen and seventeen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the decision of the government, to make these passages free, was in order to encourage that class of immigration?—A. Absolutely.

Q. But it was felt that a child, unaccompanied by its parents, under that age, would not come under that provision of free passage? They are not barred from Canada?—A. Oh, no, they may come. There is nothing to prevent them if they are in good health, but they do not come under this \$80 and \$100 grant.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Is that covered by an Order in Council, or by departmental instructions, this discrimination against children under fourteen?—A. As far as the grant is concerned, the instructions come by Order in Council.

Q. But it only applies to the Empire Settlement Scheme?—A. No, not necessarily. Before the Empire Settlement Scheme was underway, there were grants for juvenile immigration by the government.

Q. That took place under instructions of the Department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And not by Order in Council?—A. Yes, by Order in Council.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Perhaps I was to blame in the way I put my question. You are considering one phase of it, and I have in mind another. Is there any minimum age for children coming to Canada, not by assisted passage, or anything of the kind? Suppose the parents of a boy twelve years of age gave him the money to come to Canada, is he allowed to come?—A. If he is coming to somebody here who would take care of him.

Q. Suppose he wanted to come to this country?—A. A boy twelve years of age?

Q. Are they excluded under fourteen years of age?—A. They are excluded under fourteen years of age in connection with the society placements.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. I do not care about society placements, leave the assisted passages, and all the rest out of it. My question is: is there a minimum age limit on immigrants coming into this country?—A. No, there is no minimum age limit on immigrants coming into the country. But, if I were an officer, I would not accept a child of twelve coming in on his own, to make his own way.

Q. Well, then, there are restrictions, you would not let him in?—A. I would not call it a restriction; I do not know that you could term it a restriction. A boy of twelve, making his way to the docks and getting on board ship, that does not—

Q. My point is this: they are not allowed to come in under fourteen years.—A. Without coming to somebody's care?

Q. Yes.—A. No, sir.

Q. With their parents, they are?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Or on the juvenile scheme, on the assisted passage scheme, they are allowed to come in. Take children who do not come under the assisted passage, or the juvenile scheme. Is there any minimum age limit? In other words, could people in England send a boy over here thirteen years of age, to some friends in Canada?—A. No, sir, there is no minimum.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I think the point they want to get at is, that if people paid their full fare, and if there was some one to take care of them after they got here, could they come here under fourteen years of age?

The WITNESS: That would be up to you to decide, sir. We have not had it put up to us.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Is it not a fact that they are at present excluded?—A. Only those coming under this particular assistance. As I suggested a while ago, I have yet to have any of these people suggest that they should come and pay their fare.

Q. Supposing that I find a placement in Canada for a child under fourteen years of age from Great Britain, by what authority would you exclude that child?—A. I would not exclude that child, but I would not give you \$80 assistance.

Q. Dr. Edwards' question was outside of the Empire plan altogether. I understood you to say that you do not allow in children under fourteen years of age, even although they pay, outside of the Empire Settlement plan?—A. As soon as Dr. Edwards added "coming to their friends" I said, "yes" at once. That child could come, of course.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. If you know the destination of a child under fourteen you allow it to come in?—A. Yes, under those circumstances, and being nominated to a friend or parent.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. If you knew the destination of a child under fourteen then you would allow it to come in?—A. Under these circumstances of his being nominated to a friend or parent and coming in under any society up to now; but seeking this particular grant; no.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: In any particular case, be it one or a dozen, if his case is referred to me I take it upon myself to say whether a child should come in or whether he should stay out. I look upon the Immigration Department as being the guardian of the people who come to the country.

Mr. CAHAN: I will ask, since the Minister is going on the stand, by what authority he is making that assertion?

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I have authority under that (indicating). And, Mr. Chairman, I object to this gentleman finding fault with me. I have just as much right as any gentleman in the room to ask a question.

Mr. CAHAN: Ask a question, but don't make a statement.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: If I can give assistance to my deputy in making a statement I am going to do so.

Mr. BROWN (Lisgar): I think the feeling is that we do not have to have recourse to the procedure of the law courts. I think the committee wants information and it wants the information from any source. I think that should be the general attitude of the committee and we should not be too closely handicapped by the technicalities of law courts.

Mr. MCGIBBON: We have that information. The Minister says he would let them in. I would infer from that that they could not get in without his consent.

The WITNESS: So much would depend. Take your section 3 of the Act. I suppose when you ask the question, of course, you mean provided they complied with section 3.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Those restrictions in regard to minors are the same as the minors from Europe?—A. We have no movement of that kind from Europe.

Q. They are forbidden from Europe altogether?—A. We have no such movement. May I make that clear. We have heard so much of it in an insinuating way in the columns and the articles one reads on immigration. There is no \$80 assistance and no assisted passage in any way, shape, form, or manner, from the continent.

Q. This discussion is largely concerning those who are not assisted as well as those assisted?—A. What I was quoting for the information of the committee was just what we do for children in connection with the assistance which we grant. I was giving you the details for children, and why the assistance takes that form. I was going on to explain why that assistance was given and to whom. I think I had arrived at Number 2:

They are proceeding as members of families with parents or other approved guardians or are proceeding to join their parents or other approved guardians or relations.

That is children coming to an approved guardian; nominated by their parents to an approved guardian, or nominated by their nearest relatives to an approved guardian; but that does not bring in the point you are raising.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. My point was simply this: Is a good, healthy, vigorous looking lad of 13 years 11 months excluded?—A. Of course, there is always the border line to any regulation.

Q. Make it 13 years and 10 months if you like, or 13 years and 9 months. Many boys of that age or younger are making their living. Now, that boy is sent by friends from the old land. He says, "I want to go to Canada." Would you let him in?—A. Not on his own. I would not if I were an officer.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. By what authority would you exclude him?—A. He is liable to become a public charge.

Q. I am asking you under what Statute or Order in Council do you find that you can exercise that discretion?—A. Under the Act, sir, as being liable to become a public charge.

Q. It is on that ground?—A. Yes, naturally; a boy of 13 making his way in Canada—

Q. Would you exclude him in every case?—A. Well, in every case? Practically in every case coming on his own. It has never been put up to us before in that way. I do not know of any that are trying to come. But on the general grounds of administration I would say yes; that a boy like that would be the exception if he would do well.

By Mr. Brown (Lisgar):

Q. Are you not considering questions that are only likely to arise in a very few cases. In the case of such a boy as Dr. Edwards has described, you would exclude him under the clause you have quoted if he was entirely on his own; but in the case of parents sending such a boy to Canada and directing him to certain persons who would assume responsibility for him, would you exercise discretion in the matter?—A. Absolutely. We do it every day, sir.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. You have authority under Section 3 of the Act?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. Where are there any institutions in Canada that do employ and are allowed to employ children of 13 years of age?—A. Institutions in Canada? I do not know, sir, I do not know of any myself.

Number 3 reads:—

They are proceeding with the consent of their parents or guardians to a home approved by the Dominion government.

Number 4 reads:—

They are proceeding under a scheme approved by the Secretary of State and the Dominion Government. The expenses of the transportation of children shall be shared equally by the Secretary of State and the Dominion Government.

This is entirely in relation to where we assist jointly with the old country government. There are other details. There is one more paragraph in connection with assisted passage, and this concerns children proceeding to Canada under the auspices of a voluntary society:—

Assistance is given at the rate of \$80 per head towards the cost of transportation of children coming to Canada under the auspices of a recognized voluntary society and the rate is \$100 per head to children destined to points west of the Province of Ontario.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. What is the emigrant's age?—A. Fourteen:—

The ocean fare has been fixed at £11.10 so that the voluntary society obtains a certain amount for administration expenses.

Then, the number of societies and so on. I would be glad to give them. They can be secured out of the report. Does that cover what you were after, Mr. Stewart?

Mr. STEWART: Yes.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. May I ask a question? Dealing with the whole question of land settlement and colonization from the Atlantic to the Pacific, is there any other scheme

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

or project under which land settlement is favoured or assisted or promoted except under the Empire Settlement Scheme?—A. You mean by the government? By the department?

Q. Yes?—A. No other scheme I know of. Of course, there is your Soldiers' Settlement proposition.

Q. That is for our own soldiers?—A. Yes.

Q. But I want to get a general view in my own mind, that in-as-far as the settlement of this new country goes the Empire Settlement Scheme is the only instrument of government for the promotion of land settlement and colonization in Canada for emigrants from abroad?—A. For emigrants from the United Kingdom?

Q. Yes?—A. Yes.

Q. Or from France or any other country?—A. There is no settlement scheme beyond this: that we direct and help to place people to advantage who may come. For instance, only three years ago, entirely outside of the 3,000 family scheme we undertook to place—pardon me if I do not have the exact figures—let us call it 400 families. Perhaps that is too many—about 200 families from the old country who had fifty pounds in hand of their own. We would give them the assisted passage and we would place them on farms. That was one movement. We had another movement of people for a better style of farm. We are continually working out schemes. But after working out the scheme for the 200 families—if I am right in the 200—we found the answer to that call was very small.

On the continent five years ago we said to the railways whom we looked upon as our co-operating units on the continent, that if they found 1,000 families with \$400 in hand and a certain number of families with \$800 in hand, we would place these people, under the department, to advantage on farms after bringing them here and giving them some idea of the country, and after a few months sell them a particular farm under certain terms and so on. The response to that at the time was very limited. But may I say this, that you will find, of course, as time goes on and conditions are settling in the old country we will get a great many more people with a little more money in hand than we got three or four years ago.

Q. They would be coming under the Empire Settlement Scheme?—A. No, not under the Empire Settlement Scheme. This is from the old country only.

Q. From Great Britain, under the Empire Settlement Scheme?—A. In this instance? For example, the offer to place 200 families with fifty pounds, they would come under the Empire Settlement Scheme at no cost to the old country except their help in the assisted passage of these people; but no cost to them for settlement.

Q. Then I understand that outside of the Empire Settlement, there is some scheme—I use that in its proper sense—whereby you do assist those coming in to settle on the land by assisting them in respect of their passage?—A. Nothing, nothing whatsoever, in any shape or form. We assist them when they are here to select the right land out of a certain number of lots that we have to offer them, and place them.

Q. With reference to those who have come in and whom you are endeavouring to assist?—A. We tell them on the other side what they are coming to. There is a full description of a certain number of farms in a certain section of the country in which these people may be placed. These descriptions were given in these cases to both railways, and we divided the number between the two railways. We gave them an allotment. If it was one thousand in the first case, we gave them five hundred each. It may have been more than that. We gave them all the particulars of the type of settler; that is, people must have so much money in hand. If I remember well it was \$400 in hand to be placed with the railways

to be handed to us in connection with our care of them, such as buying cattle, sheep and chickens and supervising that particular work until they were settled.

Q. Now, one other question. Outside of the settlement of farmers and farm labourers and domestic servants, is there any other way under the law and under the Orders in Council in which persons may come in from continental countries, preferred or otherwise, for the purpose of carrying on any undertaking in this country other than farm labour or domestic service? For instance, suppose a Belgian wishes to come in to prosecute an undertaking in this country. It may be the manufacture of cotton or of silk or worsted or some other undertaking; how does he get into the country under the law as it now stands?—A. From Germany upon the continent, including your Scandinavian countries, any citizen of good health, being mentally and physically fit, with enough money—we do not lay down any schedule, but he must give us some assurance that he is able to look after himself in any project he undertakes.

Q. I accept that statement. But tell me where under the law you find any authority for that? I have looked through it in vain. I understand that that Order in Council—?—A. 183.

Q. Yes, 183: "From and after the 15th February, 1923, and until otherwise ordered, the landing in Canada of immigrants of all classes and occupations, is hereby prohibited, except as hereinafter provided." Then it goes on to show that he must show to the satisfaction of the Immigration Department that he is a bona fide agriculturist entering Canada to farm and has sufficient means to begin farming in Canada. (2) A bona fide farm labourer entering Canada to follow that occupation and has reasonable assurance of employment. (3) A female domestic servant entering Canada to follow that occupation and has reasonable assurance of employment"; and then it goes on to the wife and child, the United States citizen and the British subject. And then "(7) A person who has satisfied the minister that his labour or service is required in Canada." Now, must a man of fortune who wishes to undertake some industrial occupation here, concerning whose financial standing there is no doubt, who can pass the medical examinations, must he apply to you and satisfy you that his labour or service is required in Canada before he is allowed to enter?—A. Not if he comes from anywhere on the continent from Germany up.

Q. How do you work that out? Where is the authority; where is the loophole under which that comes in?—A. The authority or loophole I tried to explain in the earlier part of my talk in reference to the Continent. In 183, which is part of it, it prevented people from coming in unless they were coming to sure employment, etc. The man you describe would have no difficulty in coming in, just by submitting the facts to the immigration officer, and he would pass them on to the director for approval. I am not positive for how long, but Regulation 183 had only been in force a few months. We were working on the immigration question. There were the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National at that time—the transportation companies. May I explain that within a few months of my taking charge I recommended to my minister that for the future—I am digressing from your question for the moment; I want to make the thing clear—where we were in a position to place certain numbers of people, that no more would we grant or allot to ocean transportation companies a given quota for a given purpose. From then on, the position was that the allotment would be divided between the two Canadian national interests, the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific. This is the explanation of what was done in connection with Belgium and France and Holland, Switzerland and the Scandinavian countries—rather than suggest that these countries were named by Order in Council as preferred. I think it would be just as well that this should be just among ourselves here.

Q. Let us have the real facts?—A. From an international point of view it should not be stated that some countries are preferred as against others. I am giving all the facts. I am making a suggestion that perhaps it should not be broadcast. It was decided that it should not be an Order in Council naming one preferred country from another. But with all the national institutions co-operating with us it was natural—it is completely understood now, of course—without any Order in Council, without any agreement, but just in a general understanding and in a general way.

Q. Then it is an understanding outside the law, as I understand it?—A. Yes and no.

Q. Outside the law. For instance, let me give you an example. I have a number of relatives living in France. They are of French nationality; some of them young men of fortune who might come in here, and who are experts in electrical development, experts in mechanical development, experts in other respects. How can I bring those young men in here, and under what clause of the law can I bring them in, except this, that I have to apply to you and satisfy you that their services at the time are actually required in Canada?—A. I quite agree and admit that as far as you are concerned if you are reading the law only and not seeking for any further information....

Q. I understand that your department must act under the law?—A. Yes, that is quite right, and the Order in Council is part and parcel of the law; but this was a definite understanding as between the department and those interests that these countries would not be called upon—of course, as far as a person satisfying the authorities that his labour is required in Canada, may I suggest that that was put in 183 only two years ago on April 8, 1926.

Q. Yes?—A. And it was to cover the countries below the line, that we were not operating this particular section under—if I make myself clear.

Q. If it is necessary for the private information of the committee, could we have in writing a statement of the immigrants allowed into the country outside of the law and outside of the Orders in Council?—A. You have it now. Any man is allowed into the country who is in good health physically and mentally, has a proper passport, and is able to take care of himself, if coming from what are known as preferred countries.

Q. Under these circumstances?—A. Yes; unless something happens. He may come from anywhere from Germany up, sir, into this country. He must have his passport viséd.

Q. I assume he has his passport and is coming. I would like to know under what authority you admit him. I think I should be able to look at the law of the country and see what immigrants are allowed in without having to inquire about concessions made to Germany or Norway or Sweden, France, or Belgium. I think we should have a clear expression in regard to that and an understanding. If it is not within the law, then there should be some way of bringing it within the law.

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that Mr. Egan answer that question at the next meeting. It is one o'clock.

The Committee adjourned until Tuesday, March 13.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, March 14, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The Committee proceeded with the consideration of the Immigration Act and Regulations, and the general subject of immigration.

W. J. EGAN recalled:

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Just before you commence, Mr. Egan, in order to connect with a matter which perhaps should have been taken up yesterday with Doctor Amyot, can you tell us by what authority the appointment of these medical officers was placed under the Department of Health? Is there any section in the Act governing that, or was it done by order in council, or how was it done?—A. Placed under the Department? They are not under the Department. They work in co-operation with the Department, carrying out for us that which the Act calls for in connection with the inspection of immigrants coming in, so that they may advise as to their capacity or ability to pass under certain medical conditions, for which the Act provides.

Q. My question was, Mr. Egan, is there any section in the Act—your Immigration Act or any other Act—or was it by order in council that these medical officers were appointed by the Department of Health, to come under the Department of Health?—A. There is nothing in the Act of which I know at the moment, but remembering the evidence yesterday I rather think it was by order in council.

Q. Am I right in saying that you require these medical inspectors?—A. Yes.

Q. And your Department would make a requisition on the Department of Health for the appointment of such inspectors?—A. Yes, that is right.

Mr. CAHAN: May we have before us these orders in council which authorize the Department of Health to perform the inspection service for the Immigration Department.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. What I understood was that the Act required certain physical qualifications in intending or proposed immigrants; that your Department asked the Department of Health to make these examinations? Is that right?—A. You mean in this last appointment?

Q. No, the general practice.—A. No. In other days, before the Department of Health was organized, the Department of Immigration had its own officers of health, but what happened actually on the organization of the Department of Health and any order in council connecting them with the Department of Immigration, I know nothing of.

Q. Some time came at least when the Department of Health were asked to perform the inspection service for the Department of Immigration?—A. They have been doing that work at all times, sir.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. I thought you said, at one time there was no Department of Health?—
A. No; we had our own medical men there. The Chief Medical Officer of the Department of Immigration was taken over by the Department of Health.

Q. When was that done?—A. That was before my coming in to the Department of Immigration.

Q. Have you any idea at all?—A. Perhaps someone here would know. It may be in the Act of the Department of Health.

Q. Would you find that out?—A. Yes.

Q. When did the Department of Health take up the inspection service for the Department of Immigration and under what authority? Was it simply a letter asking for it, or an order in council?—A. I may say that as far as I am concerned, since I have been in charge of the Department, and because the practice was established, I have always consulted with them in connection with medical affairs, suggesting, perhaps, that for the better despatch of passengers we ought to have one more doctor here, or two more doctors there, and so on.

Q. And they have been under the Department of Health?—A. Under the Department of Health.

Q. When did you take over?—A. October, 1923.

Q. Would you make a note to see if there is any documentary authority, either by letter, orders in council or otherwise, when the change was made, whereby the Department of Health took on this inspectional service?—A. Yes. (See productions at pages 756, 759 post.)

Q. Now, with regard to these medical officers who have been appointed comparatively recently in England, you spoke as if they were appointed by the Department of Health. They are, in reality, under the Civil Service Commission?—A. Entirely.

Mr. CAHAN: We want the orders in council governing the whole matter of inspection. (See productions at pages 756, 759 post.)

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Has your department ever overridden the decisions of the medical officers?—A. The decisions of the medical officers are either approved or negated by a Board of Inquiry and not by the officers of the department.

(At this point Mr. Kay, Chairman, left the chair, which was assumed by Hon. Mr. Sinclair, Acting Chairman.)

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Who is on the Board of Inquiry?—A. It depends on the port. There may be three, or five, or there may be seven, or the officer may be on the Board alone.

Q. Medical men or civilians?—A. No, the medical officers report to these boards.

Q. Has this Board of Inquiry ever overridden the decision of the medical officers?—A. They find according to the evidence.

Q. I asked you if they have ever overridden the decisions of the medical officers?—A. Not that I know of.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. The Board takes the evidence of the medical officers?—A. Yes.

Q. And all the other evidence relating to the case, and decides whether or not the immigrant shall be deported or allowed to enter?—A. Yes; they make their recommendation, and that is always submitted to the department, whether the finding is for or against the immigrant making the application, or who has been rejected by the Board of Inquiry.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Cahan asked for any orders in council having regard to inspection. I would suggest that we have in pamphlet form all the orders in council well back, so as to get the history of these regulations, not only about inspections, but also admissions as well.

Mr. CAHAN: May I ask a question to clear up in my mind some matters which were dealt with previously?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Can you give us approximately the number of immigrants who have come in from the continent during the last several years, year by year?—A. I cannot give you this year, but I can for a number of years previously, but this year's statistics I have not with me.

Q. It will suit my purpose if you will give me that information for a number of years back. I want to get an idea of the flow of immigration from the continent.—A. From, say, 1921?

Q. Yes, give me the number coming in since 1921.—A. From the British Isles—

Q. No, just from the continent.—A. From the continent only, sir? 1921, 26,156; 1922, 21,634; 1923, 16,372; 1924, 55,120; 1925, 42,366; 1926, 39,717; 1927, 72,588.

Q. Now, Mr. Egan, could you divide that, and tell us in each year how many of those came in as farmers or farm labourers, how many came in as domestic servants, and how many came in for other purposes?—A. Yes, I think so. Not for the several years, but I can have that prepared and submit it to you.

Q. Have you it for any one year?—A. Yes, for 1926 and 1927. It is not divided as to continental, but the entire total. The statement of immigrants via ocean ports—

Q. If you have not the exact figures they can be submitted later, but can you give me the proportion which came in for farmers and farm labourers and for domestic servants?—A. Out of the total immigration in 1926 and 1927 of 122,966—

Q. I am speaking only as from the continent now. A. I cannot give you the separate figures.

Q. Is it possible to obtain them?—A. Yes, I can obtain them for you for each of those years, if you wish.

Q. I simply wanted to ascertain clearly the number of those immigrants from the continent who came in as farmers and farm labourers and those who came in as domestics, and the remainder who came in for mechanical, mining or other purposes.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Do you want this statement filed as an exhibit in the evidence, or just tabled before the Committee?

Mr. CAHAN: I would like to have it produced at the next sitting.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Put upon the table?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes.

Mr. MCGIBBON: Could we not have it printed as part of the evidence, Mr. Cahan, so that it will be available to everybody?

The WITNESS: I will be glad to furnish that.

(See production at page 766 post.)

By Hon. Mr. Tolmie:

Q. I would like to ask to what extent has the government, in evolving its immigration policy, worked with the various railway companies, those companies which are so deeply interested in immigration? Are you working

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

together under the present policy, and was that evolved by conference with the railways, or only just laid out by the government?—A. At the moment, do you mean?

Q. Yes, your present policy in vogue now.—A. The railways and the department do confer together before the beginning of each year's program as to just how they shall work for that particular year. This year you will find in the evidence which has been submitted the contract with the railways, and exactly what it means. I can define it for you. I am presuming that you want to know the history of the arrangement between the railways and government.

Q. Yes, as to how much collaboration and how many conferences you have had.—A. The railway agreement is an arrangement entered into in September, 1925, between the Immigration Department and the two Canadian railway systems for the purpose of recruiting, transporting, and placing in Canada agricultural families, farm labourers, domestic servants, and so forth, from all parts of Europe. The agreement covers, at the present moment,—originally it included Germany, which has since withdrawn—the countries Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Austria, Hungary, Jugo-Slovakia, Latvia, Roumania, the Free State of Danzig, Lithuania, Esthonia and Russia. Germany, as I said, was in at the beginning, but has since withdrawn.

Under the agreement, the railways undertake to place in the European states mentioned and covered by the agreement, special representatives, who work on a salary basis and have no direct interest in the sale of tickets, and do not act as booking agents. I want to make that perfectly clear. It was definitely understood in that arrangement that these men going over for the railways would be men of Canadian experience, not necessarily Canadian born, but men with Canadian experience and a knowledge of the fields where they were going to place these farmers or farm labourers, and they were selected for the purpose of representing the executives of their companies rather than the transportation end, in the selection of type, because in the first period of the railway agreement they were the selectors of type, and the officials of the government simply accepted the certificates, unless it were a very, very glaring case, of which there were very few. Out of 30,000 handled in one year, our officers of necessity rejected 132 all told. The certificate issued by these particular officers was accepted by the departmental official who was on the continent for the purpose of visaing the passports of the prospective immigrants to Canada. These certificates simply certified that he was fit for the particular task to which he was coming. The certificate is known as an occupational certificate. This is issued by the special representatives to persons belonging to, or supposed to belong to, one or other of the classes of farm labourers, farmers, or domestic servants. The immigrant presents himself, with his passport, and occupational certificate, to the Canadian Immigration Officer in Europe. Our offices are established at various points, such as Antwerp, Rotterdam, Hamburg, Danzig, and Riga. On the arrival of the immigrant in Canada, the railway issuing the certificate is called upon to place that immigrant in agricultural employment. I think that covers the point, with the exception of the renewed agreement, which is already on the file.

Q. What is the method of handling your settlers when you land them on this side? Do you recognize the necessity of colonization in the immigration policy?—A. Yes, our whole work is directed in that respect.

Q. What is the ratio between the actual amount expended on colonization and the actual amount expended in administration of the Department at the present time?—A. I would have to work that out for you, sir.

Q. Could we have that?—A. Yes, sir. (*See production at page 762 post.*)

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Do the railways take any part in your colonization?—A. They have their own colonization branches, yes, sir.

By Hon. Mr. Tolmie:

Q. Has anything been done, in any way, to implement the Clarendon Report?—A. You mean, extending the Three Thousand Family Settlement Scheme?

Q. Yes? Has any arrangement been made with British Columbia, or Alberta, with regard to carrying that out in any way?—A. You mean, the continuing of the colonization scheme?

Q. I understand, when Lord Clarendon went through British Columbia, he made the statement that there was room in northern British Columbia, alone, in the territory he traversed, for ten thousand families. Has anything been done in the way of carrying that out; has anything been done with a view to settling those lands under these conditions?—A. That is a matter of policy, and I shall have to leave that, if I may be permitted, to the Minister to answer.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. I am not a member of this Committee, but I would like to ask a question. This railway agreement is, in effect, an agreement between the Department and the railways?—A. Yes, but with this difference. This year the Minister has decided, and the arrangement is made by separate letters written by the Minister himself to the Presidents of the railways, that the movement must be a checking of placements, and that the function of government returns to the Canadian Government Offices on the Continent, and that the certificate is not accepted as a guarantee that that man is of the type suitable for farm work.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. I notice in the printed proceedings of March 8th, that we have the railway agreement on page 30. The one that you are referring to does not seem to be printed here. Has that been signed?—A. You mean this year's, sir?

Q. Yes.—A. I have not gone over this; I have just seen it.

Q. On page 30 is the agreement of 1925. Does it cover 1926, too?—A. I have not read this.

Q. I do not see any agreement such as you are referring to in your answer to Mr. Heaps; has that agreement been signed?—A. Yes.

Q. I think that should be part of the record.—A. All right, sir. (*See production at page 732 post.*)

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. How many immigrants were brought out under the previous agreements with the railway companies?—A. By each railway?

Q. The aggregate by both?—A. I will be glad to supply that to the Committee. (*See productions at page post.*)

Q. After these immigrants came into the country, does the Department keep any record of what became of them?—A. In some cases we have attempted to, and in other cases we could not.

Q. Have you any record of how many stayed here in the country, and how many did not?—A. No. We can give you some idea of those who remained, of those whom we found here when we investigated. It was a business proposition between three interests. There were a great many complaints that the thing was not working to advantage, and others were commending it to the highest heaven. We carried on a part inquiry. We did not cover every case, but we covered certain sections of the country. We wanted to find out what they were doing and how they were getting along, and we have that in evidence.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. I wonder if you would mind letting us have that information?—A. The information in reference to our investigation of the railway placements, is that what you mean?

Q. Yes.—A. And the continuity of these people on the land? (*See productions at page 764 post.*)

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Is it true that, in the years during which the agreement with the railway companies was in force, the bulk of the immigration from the Continent came in under, and in pursuance of, the railway agreements?—A. Undoubtedly, sir.

Q. And after they came in, had you any system requiring a report from those immigrants when they settled? I presume that you saw that they did settle on the land?—A. Oh, no. The immigrants that were brought in by the railways, sir, were taken care of by the railways.

Q. They were to be taken care of under the Land Settlement Scheme, or to go on farms, or as farm labourers, were they not?—A. Oh, yes, as farm labourers; most of them as farm labourers.

Q. Have you any system of inspection by which you can check up whether the railway companies fulfil the terms of their contract by giving them farm employment?—A. Yes, we have checked it up, sir.

Q. That all of them go on the farm?—A. We have checked that up. They do not all go on the farms.

Q. They do not?—A. No, sir.

Q. Under the agreements, they were to go on the farms, were they not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What proportion of them did not go on the farms?—A. We can only give you that proportion of those who were investigated.

Q. Have you no system whereby you can check up, by reports, concerning individual settlers, whether they go on the farms and continue on the farms?—A. Yes. As far as settlement is concerned, that is an entirely different proposition to the farm labour proposition. Under our own Continental scheme, or the railways, we can give you all of the data, as far as the settlers proper are concerned.

Q. But the bulk of them, you say, were farm labourers?—A. Yes, or supposed to be.

Q. I will put it another way. What precautions have you taken, as a department, to prevent the Continental immigrant from coming in as a farm labourer, under the terms of the agreements with the two railways, and then going into other occupations and swelling competition?

An Hon. MEMBER: That is impossible.

Q. I do not know anything of any impossibilities; anything is possible. But I am asking what precautions you are taking?—A. Departmentally, you are referring to now?

Q. Departmentally—by which you insure that those coming in as farm labourers shall actually enter upon and continue in the work upon the farms; what precautions have you taken?—A. By having an investigation made from time to time, in given districts, and the names supplied by the railways of their placements. We exact the placement address from the railways, of the people that they are bringing in from the Continent, but we do not investigate every address or every name that they give us. We do investigate quite a number of them, and we have a very complete report in connection with last year, and the year before.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. What percentage of them have left the farms or farm occupations?—A. I have it tabulated, those we accepted. I can give you that without very much trouble; that is all in evidence on my file.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. When you make these solicitations in Europe, is there an understanding that these people are to remain in this country?—A. Absolutely.

Q. For any length of time?—A. We have stressed it. If he is of the agricultural type—this is the principle that I have laid down: if we can keep him at farm work for a year or two, we can make him realize the advantage of remaining in Canada at farm work. I usually insist upon a twelve months' agreement of employment. I am speaking from the departmental point of view. That is what we lay down, that there must be at least a twelve months' engagement.

Q. Is that the minimum length of time that they are supposed to stay in this country?—A. That is the minimum, as far as we are concerned.

Q. After twelve months they are at liberty to go where they like?—A. As a matter of fact, they are at liberty to go where they like after they land.

By Hon. Mr. Guthrie:

Q. A man may come in as a farm labourer, under a twelve months' agreement, and you have no control over the man if he desires to change his employment a month after he gets here?—A. None whatsoever.

Q. He may work in Saskatchewan, and then move to some other province?—A. That is quite right.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Taking the three prairie provinces, could you give us a statement covering the period between the two censuses, in the five year period?—A. That is only three years?

Q. In the three prairie provinces. Tell us the number that went into those three prairie provinces, as farm labourers, and approximately how many remained as farm labourers?—A. I will be very glad to give you that, to the best advantage I can. I will give you that from everything we have in the shape of evidence, accumulated in respect of our investigation. (*See productions at page 764 post appendix.*)

Q. I am not asking this by way of criticism, but I just want to see the number that come in as farm labourers and then go out in to other general occupations, or go across the border?—A. It is because they have not been living up to their contracts with the railways, and with the Government. I made it my business to broach this to the Continental Governments, that the best way of protecting their nationals was to see that only the right kind of men received passports for that particular kind of work in this country. I told them that the railways were our two national institutions, and were prepared to stand by their agreement to give them labour. These men do not, and will not remain at farm work. This was submitted to the Minister, and he has renewed the agreement this year with the distinct understanding that he may stop it at any minute, if they are not fulfilling the letter of their contract, or the people that they are bringing out are not fulfilling their contract. Furthermore, our officers can say, "yes, this man is qualified to go," or "this man is not qualified to go."

Q. I am not criticizing.—A. I am just trying to explain.

Q. I am endeavouring to ascertain whether the railway companies, who have brought in the bulk of the immigrants from the Continent, are really complying with the spirit of their agreement. That is what I am endeavouring to find out. I understand that the spirit of their agreement was that they were to bring in immigrants as farm labourers, from the Continent, and that they must insure their entering farm employment, and continuing on the farm. Is that not the spirit?—A. That is the spirit, sir.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. I want to know what means have been taken to check up the railway companies to see that they have carried out the spirit of their agreement. It seems to me that there should be some supervision by the Department.—A. We have, to a certain extent only. We have not attempted to follow thirty thousand people coming in in one year, or thirty-five thousand in another. We have reported to the railways that we were dissatisfied with this particular movement, or that particular movement, and we know that they have endeavoured to secure these people. I have even had railway officials come to me and ask me if I would not deport, I think it was some Jugo-Slaves, because they would not go on the land. Of course, I had no right to deport them because they would not go on the land, if they were able to look after themselves after they got here. I could not help them out in that respect. I quite understand, sir, that it is not a tone of criticism, nor am I defending anything. I am just trying to explain as fully as I possibly can.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. It is well understood, from the propaganda or advertising that you do on the Continent, as well as in Great Britain, that the general policy of this government, and of the governments for many years past, has been to favour particularly those who are going on the land, or coming out as domestic servants. Those are the classes which were specially favoured as immigrants to this country. That knowledge would be generally disseminated, and those anxious to come out from the Continent of Europe would recognize the fact that farmers, or those going on the land, or domestic servants, would have a more favourable reception, and they would classify themselves as farmers, or intending farmers, or domestic servants. I notice in the report of the Minister of Immigration that you have the immigrants classified according to occupation?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are those occupations given at the offices on the Continent, and in England, or are they classified, according to occupation, after they got here?—A. No, the declaration of their profession or vocation was taken before they left.

Q. I notice that for the year 1926, reading from the Annual Report, out of a total immigration of 96,064, you have, in the farm classes, 48,000, which includes males, females, and children. So that, before they started from the other side, nearly half of them were known to be of the specially favoured farm class?—A. Is that taken from the total figures?

Q. Yes. It is on page 9, of the Report on Immigration and Colonization for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1926. The total is 96,064, and under the heads of farming classes, including males, females, and children, there is 48,000; about half, you see. Then there are other classifications, taken before they start. There were others, who represented themselves, and were accepted by the Government, as mechanics, artisans, and people of other occupations?—A. Yes.

Q. And were accepted as such?—A. Yes.

Q. Although the general policy is to favour those going on the land, only about half got on the land, according to the figures for that year?—A. First of all, we do not advertise on the Continent, in any shape, form or manner, except to a certain extent in Holland. There is no advertising by the Government anywhere on the Continent, but we do guarantee to any continental, coming as a farm labourer, if he comes under our particular auspices, and is willing to work on the farm, that we will find him work on the farm. Quite a number of these people have come in under other vocations in life, there is no question about that. They have been admitted, but not necessarily from the railway agreement countries. They may have come from Germany; they may

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

have come from France, Switzerland, or the Scandanavian countries. Those people are permitted to come as long as they are in good health, mentally and physically.

Q. You would not restrict the number coming from the Continent, for instance, if they were of what you might call the farm type, or the class who were liable to be?—A. They have to be coming to assured employment.

Q. That is, on the Continent?—A. Oh, yes. They must show us a sure employment that they are coming to, or we assure it to them.

Q. Do I understand that they must be nominated by friends or relatives here?—A. Not necessarily. We do have considerable nominations by relatives here, but the countries under the railway agreements, they secure labour for them.

Q. What about those who come from outside of the railway agreements, on their own?—A. From countries covered by the railway agreements?

Q. From any part of Europe?—A. You see, from Germany up, any man may come.

Q. Take from Germany down?—A. From Germany down, then he cannot come into this country unless he shows he is coming to assured employment. He shows that on the other side, at the port, and it must be satisfactory evidence to us.

Q. What proportion of those who were settled on the land, under the Soldiers' Land Settlement Scheme, have remained there?—A. I would only be speaking from memory. I would prefer to give you the exact figures. (*See productions at page 764 post.*)

By Mr. Brown (Lisgar):

Q. What kind of evidence would you accept to show that he was coming to assured employment?—A. He would have to show our officer on the other side, first of all—coming to employment as a farm labourer?

Q. Yes.—A. The first view of the man is, "Is he a farm labourer; is he physically fit for farm labour?" Then his documents, if he is not coming in under our auspices or the railways. "What correspondence have you had with anybody in Canada to show that you have assured employment?" Our officer would look over that correspondence, and if he was satisfied that it was genuine, he would pass him as a prospective farm labourer. If he were not satisfied, he would hold him until we investigated, perhaps here.

Q. Do the railway companies, or your Department, enter into any arrangement with individual farmers, or farmers' organizations, regarding the employment? What part has the farmer employer in this arrangement?—A. Many farmer employers in Canada nominate individuals from the Continent, as well as, under the Empire Settlement Scheme, from England. The railways make a canvass, I understand, of all the districts in Canada, and secure employment, we will say, of a Norwegian with a Norwegian, or a Jugo-Slavian with a Jugo-Slavian, if such a thing exists in the case of farmers in this country.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. I have just been reading this agreement with the railways. I think it would make it a little clearer if you would amplify your remarks in this regard. This agreement reads as follows:

And whereas the Parties of the Second Part—that is the railway companies—by reason of their special interest in the early settlement of available unoccupied lands and their transportation facilities by land and sea are specially qualified to procure, select and settle immigrants of the classes mentioned, and have the necessary organization for that purpose.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Do I understand that, up to the time of the agreement of this year, you have permitted the railway companies to do the inviting and to certify as to the vocational fitness for prospective employment of these settlers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that is provided for in Section 1, which authorizes the railway companies to invite persons, who are citizens or residents of the country referred to, to emigrate to Canada, and settle them in Canada as agriculturalists, agricultural workers and domestic servants. Would not the answer to Mr. Brown's question be, so far as those who are brought in by the railways are concerned, that you accept the railways' certificate?—A. What we call the occupational certificate.

Q. The railways' certificate?—A. Yes.

Q. That is, the railways say, "This man is a farm labourer, and a qualified farm labourer," and they say they have employment for him, and you let him in, or you have let him in under this agreement?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Which covered a period of two years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the Department does not exercise any special supervision over them?—A. Did not.

Q. Except to check up, as you told Mr. Cahan?—A. No supervision, except to check up.

Q. You really constituted the railway companies as your immigration agents on the other side?—A. The whole scheme of the railway agreement was to incorporate the two national railways—I will not say as co-operators, but there ought to be co-operation as between two national institutions. That was the whole purpose of the railway agreement. They were already established on the Continent, and, of necessity, being national institutions in Canada, would do it conscientiously, thoroughly and with every view of protecting Canada, and the incoming immigrant.

Q. And is it true, generally speaking, that you accepted the investigations of the railway companies, and their certificate with regard to occupation and employment?—A. For one year. There were one hundred and sixty-three that we had to turn back, where there was some heart trouble, or lung trouble, and that kind of thing. We could not accept the certificate in those cases.

Q. And the changes you have made this year will allow the Minister to refuse anybody, even though he has a certificate?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. In the years immediately following 1921, was there any falling off in the percentage of British immigrants coming to Canada, as compared with those from the Continent? If there was, do you know of any change in policy, or a change in administration, or anything of that nature, that would be wholly or in part responsible for that changed percentage?—A. There has, undoubtedly, been a falling off in general British immigration.

Q. In the years immediately following 1921?—A. Yes. You are asking the question as far as immigration to Canada is concerned?

Q. Yes.—A. I would like to qualify my answer by saying that the emigration from England, to anywhere within the Dominions, has fallen off. If there has been an increased continental immigration, it is due to the railway agreements. It was a pretty well balanced proposition right through, until the railway agreements came in. There is no question about it, the railway agreements have helped to bring in a greater number of continental people. This does not necessarily apply to those from below Germany, because Germany has been making some very steady progress in the past two years, as far as immigration is concerned.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Mr. Millar asked if the falling off was due to any change in policy?—

A. It cannot be due to any change in policy, because we have done everything we possibly could to induce the British emigrant to come to this country. If he is a farm labourer, we have gone as far as to bring him over and place him on the farm. We have guaranteed to place any number. There is co-operation between the railways and ourselves, so far as British farm labour is concerned. We have given them quotas which they have never been able to fill, because they cannot get the required material in the old country; they cannot induce them to leave. We, ourselves, have tried in every way, with our settlement schemes, and our special rates.

Q. Following Mr. Millar's question, and along the very same lines, what restriction is placed upon, say, a single man without farm experience, coming from Great Britain to this country? What percentage do you permit to come, or what restrictions do you place on them to prevent them from coming?—

A. From Great Britain?

Q. Yes?—A. We do not prevent a single man coming from Great Britain, when he is mentally and physically fit.

Q. I have in my hand a hand-book on the Dominion of Canada issued by the British Government, acting in co-operation or collaboration with this government. This reads as follows:—

Single men, without farming experience, and going on the land in Canada, provided they are nominated by friends or relatives in Canada for definite agricultural employment.

(A limited number of suitable single men between the ages of 20 and 35 years, without farming experience, may be nominated by the Canadian Government.)

There is a limitation, and I would like to have it explained?—A. There is a limitation, insofar as the £2 help is concerned. We have even given a quota, an undertaking, I am afraid, far beyond our possibilities of placements of inexperienced help, to come under the £2 rate. This refers entirely to the Empire Settlement Scheme.

Q. That is under the assisted passage?—A. Under the assisted passage. Now, our quota for inexperienced help, is much bigger this year. We have been making progress, and have secured from a great number of people their preparedness and willingness to take the inexperienced British farmer; therefore, we have been able to increase the ratio from year to year as time went on.

Q. That is the reason for the limitation in the number of these suitable young men, without farming experience? That is, it is the inability to place them here in Canada?—A. Yes, to place the inexperienced.

By Mr. Ross (Moose Jaw):

Q. At one time, was there not a restriction placed on people coming from the British Isles, and from the continent as well, as to the amount of money they must have, and if there was, on what date was it put on, and on what date was it taken off?—A. Yes, undoubtedly there was a restriction. There was a restriction of \$250, as far as the Britishers were concerned.

Q. In what year was that put on?—A. I have copies of the orders in council here. In 1920 P.C. 2930 of the 29th of November, 1920, suspended between that date and the 31st of March, 1921, P.C. 294, so far as it related to mechanics and artisans, skilled and unskilled labour. During the period of suspension the mechanics and artisans were required to have \$250; the heads of families, \$250; other members of the family over 18, \$125, and those between

five and eighteen years, \$50. This was extended indefinitely on the 19th of March, 1921, and carried on under P.C. 2668, as amended and the occupational test only was applied to the Britishers on the 9th of May, 1922.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Was there any money test before 1921?—A. Yes, there was a \$25 money test previous to that date.

Q. On everybody in Great Britain?—A. Yes, on everybody excepting the agriculturist.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. I would like to go back to the question asked by Colonel Ralston in connection with the agreement with the railway companies. Rightly or wrongly there is an impression throughout the country that the railway companies are introducing citizens into this country and leaving them. Now, the agreement, which I see on page 31 of the printed proceedings of March 8, provides

agree further to transport to the countries whence they emigrated all immigrants brought by them to Canada under the agreement, who, refusing to engage in agriculture, agriculture labour, or domestic service in Canada, shall become public charges, within the period of one year from the date of their admission to Canada.

I would like to know, Mr. Egan, if any effort has been made by your department, or through you, with the railway companies to keep track of these immigrants after they are brought in? Is that feasible?—A. No, that is not a feasible proposition. You cannot begin to keep track of them.

Q. Is there any question of expense involved in that?—A. Of course, there would be an immense expense in trying to follow up practically a fading proposition, and if you try to follow it to a positive conclusion you would have to send an officer, say, to Winnipeg, to check back on a carload or a trainload, and that officer would realize within twelve hours that probably half the trainload were coming back east, or a carload was coming back east, and he would have to engage temporary officials to follow these people up. The thing is an impossible proposition.

Q. Then it really amounts to this, Mr. Egan, that immigrants brought into this country by the transportation companies—after the year has expired, the railways are freed from all responsibility so far as these immigrants are concerned?—A. Yes. That particular clause does not impose any responsibility on them whatsoever.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Following up Mr. Millar's question: Are there not other reasons for the condition he mentioned? Take, for instance, Australia and New Zealand, which were bidding for British immigration from 1921 on. I know, from my own personal knowledge, that great numbers were going from Scotland to Australia and New Zealand, rather than to Canada.—A. You mean from the Empire settlement?

Q. From any source.—A. There was, as you know, at a certain period an extreme and terrific propaganda against Canada in the British press. We tried to combat the proposition, and have to a very large extent succeeded by giving the facts. One of the very first things we did was to ask and receive from the London Times and the Manchester Guardian their promise that they would give us a chance to tell our story in the next column of the same issue containing what they considered news. I happened to be over there digging into things, and I said to the editors, "I do not ask you not to publish that which you consider

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

news, but do give us a chance within the Empire to tell our story in the next column of the same issue." That has progressed considerably, and we are having a great deal of propaganda spreading out which has stopped it. Then there is a different atmosphere since Mr. Baldwin's coming, and even previous to his coming. There is no doubt that the £11 rate, under the Empire Settlement, to Australia, is bound to have an effect upon the fibre of any average boy in these three Isles, who must of necessity have a touch of the sea in him. They carry him over to Australia for £11. The United Kingdom pays £11, and the Australian government pays another £11 to take him to Australia for a six weeks' trip. That is a £33 rate to Australia for six weeks. The transportation of that immigrant to Canada, under modern conditions of "getting together" insists upon extracting £18-10/ to bring that man over on a seven days' trip to this country, and my contention is—I hope I am not getting into a question of policy now; I am only giving an expression of opinion—that in the assisted passage you are doing wrong, and that it ought to be a flat rate and a reasonable flat rate to let these men come from the United Kingdom, because there are many good men in the United Kingdom who see the other chaps, with the £2 rate, whom he knows are not going to farm when they get here, and who are sitting back with their families and will not squander £18-10/, perhaps five times over, and if all that money were given in some way—lent, not given—to establish the men from the overseas dominions, it would, in my opinion, be much more effective.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Are there more Britishers going to Australia and New Zealand than to Canada?—A. No, it is very much the other way. I think I have something here on that.

Discussion followed.

The WITNESS: In answer to Mr. Glen's question, I may say I should have with me the figures. I do not seem to find them, but I can bring them in later. (*See productions at page 765 post.*) However, let me answer the question in this way. Immigration from the United Kingdom is more than one-half of the total immigration within the Empire from England; that is, we are always more than South Africa, New Zealand and Australia combined, with the exception of one three months' period some five or six years ago, and that three months' period was grasped upon for insinuation purposes and propaganda purposes. It is not true. There are more people coming from the Old Country to settle in Canada than to all the others combined. For example, if the total were 52,000, it would mean 27,000 or 28,000 to Canada, and the balance divided amongst the others.

By Mr. Ross (Moose Jaw):

Q. There have been insinuations made that the Department was not doing all it could to get British immigration. You stated there had been a money restriction. That money restriction was taken off by the Department?—A. Yes, in 1922.

Q. Since that time it has been easier for people to come from England than it was before?—A. Undoubtedly. If you take a mechanic and his family, assuming he had a family of five, it would be somewhere around \$1,000 which he had to have in hand before he could move. That was under former conditions. We have done everything we can to make immigration easier for the Britishers—outside of the farmers, who are still up against this £18-10/ fare.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. I understood that bulk nominations are allowed up to May of this year. Will you explain what that means?—A. From Canada for the United Kingdom?

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. Yes.—A. Of course, of necessity, we must limit these nominations to the possibilities of placement according to the time of year. The bulk proposition is this: that a given society, railway or church, as for instance the United Church, which is moving 150 men, would not be allowed bulk nominations for any body of men unless they gave us the positive place of placement, and that applies to any institution undertaking to place men.

Q. Why is it limited to May of this year?—A. On account of past experience. If you bring in too many people, particularly the inexperienced farm helpers, say, in the middle of June when the farmers are sitting tight and waiting for something to happen—

Q. That is annual limitation for the first five or six months?—A. It is all right to get them in here when the farmer needs them in the early Spring and early Summer, so that he may carry them over the busy time and give them the experience of the harvest, and so on.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Are the restrictions more strict now than before?—A. No, there is no restriction whatsoever for a Britisher coming into Canada, except as to his mental and physical condition.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. In 1921 you were not connected with the Department?—A. No.

Q. Is it not a fact that the reason for the restriction being placed then was the abnormal unemployment situation in Canada?—A. That I do not know; I presume so.

Q. It seems to me that is the reason, because immigration always has something to do with unemployment in a country. In 1921 we had a very abnormal unemployment situation, and if people did not come here it was because of that abnormal unemployment situation, and I think the government of that day was correct in putting on those restrictions.—A. I am only answering questions.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. Mr. Egan, there has been a great deal of criticism voiced throughout the country in regard to persons coming from Great Britain. In your opinion, is there not a good deal of confusion in the minds of people by their failing to distinguish between assisted passages and those who come without assistance?—A. There is no question about that.

Q. Then I understand that people coming from Great Britain who are able to pay their own way out, and able and willing to engage in any occupation whatever can come in without any restriction?—A. They can come, and are coming, to this country in larger numbers than to any other Dominion in the Empire.

Q. The restrictions apply only to those who are coming on assisted passages or on reduced fares?—A. The only restriction is, they must be of a certain type.

Q. The restrictions apply only, however, to those who are getting assistance in some way in their passage?—A. That is all—nothing else.

Q. That should be kept very clearly before this country?—A. It should be—and a great many other things. If I may go back to the question you, yourself, asked yesterday, I think, about the bow-legged lady—

Q. No, that was Mr. Millar.—A. It was asked by some member of the Committee. I may say that I have seen in black and white the story about the bow-legged lady and the reasons given why she was not allowed into this country, and you would be shocked and surprised if you saw what I saw. The bow-legged woman was not kept out of Canada, but it was found that she was a ricket girl when she was young, and until we had the doctor's certificate that this would not interfere with her earning her living and making her own way, she was admitted. I may say that she was admitted within two weeks after the story appeared.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. I have not bothered you with any questions so far. You have my sympathy for the bombardment from all sides, and I have been impressed with your desire to give full information, and I wish to congratulate you. There was, however, one thing that was not quite clear. I take it that you said that there was a kind of systematic propaganda in the British Isles to dissuade people from coming to Canada. I have not heard of it. What was the nature of it and by whom was it conducted? I refer to the campaign in England which you thought militated against the British coming here.—A. Let me explain that. In 1922 and 1923 it was acknowledged by all those who were in touch with affairs in the Old Country that this was more particularly an attack on Canada in connection with the Grand Trunk, and the feeling that we were not keeping our pledges, and Canada was this and Canada was that. This attack was bound more or less to have its effect. It would only require going over the files to understand that. That condition has been commented upon in the Old Country press, but it has altered considerably. There was also and always a preparedness to tell the most fantastic tales by the most fantastic people. We told the facts to a great many of the papers, and in a number of them, although not all by any means, the answer of the department or the answer of government was on the back pages somewhere. There must have been some intention, when we were not given the same space on the front page as was given to those fantastic stories. Ours were always boiled down.

Q. It was newspaper propaganda?—A. Yes, entirely. It was more of a financial proposition.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Yesterday we had with us the Deputy Minister of Health and in reply to a question I put to him, he said that not only were the immigrants, who came in under any assisted scheme, subject to medical inspection in Great Britain, but also any immigrant coming to Canada of his own volition, or otherwise. Is that correct?—A. If he is coming as an immigrant, yes.

Q. And if he is coming on his own?—A. As an immigrant?

Q. Yes.—A. To settle in Canada?

Q. Yes.—A. He must be medically examined.

Q. Where?—A. In one of the 334 places nominated by the Department of Health for that examination.

Q. Then why make the distinction regarding a man from Great Britain, when you admit a man from Italy, we will say, who does not come through a port where you have medical officers, and he is examined in Canada?—A. The evidence in regard to Italy was not quite sound yesterday. We have not had from Italy via the ports of New York or Boston 18 people in 18 months. We do not admit them via any of these ports. They may come up to Paris or Antwerp or Rotterdam and have their passports vised by a Canadian officer.

Q. What about South Africa or Australia?—A. In what way?

Q. As to immigrants from Great Britain. What is the disparity as between Britain and Australia and New Zealand?—A. There is none. A man from Australia would have to be examined at the port at which he entered. We have perhaps one in a year, but we have a number of people travelling, who do not come in as immigrants.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. There is an impression around the country that an immigrant coming from Great Britain has to go through a very rigid examination, that they have to be stripped and go through the examination like that for insurance, but, on the other hand, when they come from the Continent, they are given but a very cursory examination—just looked at and passed on; they do not have to strip

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

or anything of that kind.—A. A great deal of that arose from a certain letter appearing in the *Times*. There is no truth about a stripped examination. There is no question but if a doctor comes across a man whom he can tell at once has certain indications of, we will say, a venereal disease, he will stand him aside and strip him, or if he thinks he has tuberculosis he will stand him aside and strip him, but there is no such thing as a stripped examination in that sense of the word. As far as the Continent is concerned, it is true that often on the Continent, as far as the Canadian medical examinations are concerned, they may not be as thorough as they are on the British Isles for prospective British settlers, but Mr. Continental coming from nine-tenths of the parts of Europe to settle in Canada goes through something far more rigid. He is stripped and stripped and stripped again. He goes through a delousing process, not only is he stripped but he goes through a cleaning and bathing and fumigating process—his clothing receiving the same treatment—and he is kept under observation for two or three days, and he comes to our doctors, and I think you will agree that under those circumstances they can pass him very freely. Furthermore, the transportation companies are liable to certain charges if they bring people to our shores who are not fit, and there is no doubt that the transportation companies are working inland and refusing to move people without some investigation by their own medical men. To what extent that exists, I do not know, but I know this, that there is a direct reaction and a direct application on the part of friends here on behalf of people coming from certain parts of the Continent. They say, "Your Canadian doctor has rejected him," and we immediately ask, "Where was he rejected;" "At such a place," and I know at once it is a mistake because we have no Canadian doctors there. It is the doctors of the transportation company who are called by these good people "Canadian doctors." The immigrant is going through all kinds of examinations before he reaches Canada as compared with the Britishers.

By Mr. Ross (Moose Jaw):

Q. The question of men in Great Britain being examined there, and the men on the Continent not being examined, is rather interesting. To my mind that is not a restriction; it is a convenience for the immigrant to be examined overseas and to be told there that perhaps he cannot enter Canada. That certainly is a convenience to him. If he comes from some part of Europe and is not examined, arrives on this side and is then turned back if he cannot pass the examination, it would be a very great inconvenience to him. I do not think it is any restriction at all to have a man examined in England before he leaves there. It seems to me it is a convenience to him which is not given to Europeans. He must leave his home country and come over here before he can be examined.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. We have many men coming over on business, in every walk of life, to locate here, and it seems to me it is unreasonable that these men should have to go to any doctors, whether Canadian or any other doctors, when they are perfectly healthy and know that they are, and are perfectly good citizens. It also seems unreasonable for them to have to mix up with a bunch of others who perhaps are not in the same condition, before they can be allowed to come to Canada, when a man from another country can come in without any restriction at all.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. I think Mr. Arthurs' question is based on a misunderstanding of what you said. I want to get this clearly in my mind. Supposing I am a Scotch farmer and intend to settle in Canada. I have money enough to buy my ticket

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

and I look all right to the fellow at the gangplank. Do I have to go to a doctor on the other side—A. Yes, you would not get your permit for sailing unless you did—since the 14th of February.

Q. Everybody who sails to Canada intending to settle—A. In Canada? We have not yet drawn a line between a man with a million dollars or a hundred thousand and a man who has not a cent. They must all do the same.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Following up Colonel Ralston's question: take a Scotch immigrant, paying his own way. When does he receive his examination? Supposing I decide to come to Canada, and I go to the agent of the C.P.R. in Scotland, and say, "I want a ticket to Winnipeg," and they sell me one—A. Not now. They will advise you to take the examination.

Q. That is quite recent?—A. Since the 14th of February.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Following that up: supposing a man from Scotland is over here and his wife and family are in Scotland. They are very loathe to go through this examination there; they cannot possibly see any reason why they should be treated differently than a man, for instance, from South Africa or any other place, as I mentioned before, and they cannot see why they cannot be examined when they arrive in Canada and not be subjected to what they consider a certain indignity—I do not say it is an indignity—they do not see why one who is able to come here on his own should go through all this formality the same as those coming over on assisted passages.—A. The medical examination and all that you have in your Act is passed by parliament, and it is a convenience to have this examination at home. Supposing, for instance, this good lady had some contagious disease of which she knew nothing, and it was discovered by our officer at Quebec and we had to return her. Would it not have been better to examine her on the other side?

Q. If she had no disease she would not look at it from that point of view.—A. I do not agree with you. That is not the general expression of opinion from over there. We know it has been suggested and it is possible there may be some who object, but generally speaking that is not the impression.

Q. Just follow that up. Supposing this lady wanted to come in, and she had some disease and she said, "I am going to Australia via Montreal"—simply a tourist in Canada—and her ticket read to Vancouver. What action would your department take in that case?—A. With a contagious disease she cannot go through.

Q. I am not talking about a contagious disease, I am talking about any disability that might otherwise bar her?—A. There are no other disabilities that would bar her.

Q. There are no other disabilities that would bar a tourist?—A. Or an immigrant, sir.

Q. You have spoken about the man who settles here, and sends for his Scotch wife. She is not debarred from coming in if she has a physical disability, where he is already settled and can look after her, as explained yesterday, as long as it is not contagious or mental. She is admitted into the country to the care of her husband.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Did I understand you to say, that a man of means, coming from Great Britain to settle in Canada, would have to go through a medical examination, while a man of means from the Continent does not have to go through one?—A. Oh, no.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. You said that a man of means, coming to settle in Canada from Great Britain, has to go through a medical examination, while the man of means, coming from the Continent to settle in Canada, does not have to go through a medical examination?—A. No. The man that is coming to settle in Canada must be medically examined.

Q. Whether he has means or not?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Supposing this man of means sails from a port other than a port where you have doctors; what happens?—A. The transportation companies will advise him that he cannot get into Canada without having his medical certificate.

Q. He might sail on a small ship.—A. Then he would, of necessity, be examined at the port here.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. I asked you the other day to have the instructions that were issued to these medical officers produced; I do not see them here.—A. I am sorry if I overlooked anything.

Q. That naturally follows upon the admission that you have made this morning, that there is practically no medical examination at all; it is only a farce. No man could be properly examined with his clothes on, and everything of that kind. Are they examined or not, or is this whole thing a farce? Are we keeping twenty or twenty-five doctors over in Europe simply doing routine work, and passing them on their face value? Do you mean to tell this Committee that an immigrant is admitted to this country by an examination which does not include a chest examination, a heart examination, or an inspection of the surface of the body? Do you just look at him and pass him on? Is that what we are paying an army of doctors for over in Europe? The whole thing seems to be a farce.

HON. MR. STEWART: I think, in fairness to the witness, our honourable friend should have been here yesterday to question the medical officer. My honourable friend will admit that it is not a question that a layman can answer. We have the medical men here, and be glad to bring them back again to allow my honourable friend to question them. But to ask the witness, who is a layman, a question as to what a medical examination consists of, I submit, Mr. Chairman, is unfair.

MR. MCGIBBON: I submit, Mr. Chairman, that even the Minister of the Interior knows, and every layman knows, that you cannot look at a man with his clothes on and tell whether he has tuberculosis, or whether he has a disease of the heart.

HON. MR. STEWART: With all deference to my good friend, when we had a medical man on the stand, he was the proper man to ask about medical examination. My hon. friend will admit at once that he has a very great advantage over a layman. I merely suggest that it is not a question that a layman could answer.

MR. MCGIBBON: Unfortunately, I am on two important committees, both meeting at the same hour every day. This is a matter of policy. The Deputy Minister has made a statement of fact, and it is surely up to the Department to say whether they are going to have a condition of that kind, or not. It is not a question of medical evidence; it is a question of fact and procedure.

HON. MR. STEWART: I still maintain that my hon. friend could have been here yesterday, when he could have ascertained definitely from the medical officer as to how the medical examination was conducted. He went fairly fully into those details. I submit that it is not a fair question to ask the Deputy Minister of Immigration, who is a layman, whether or not, in his opinion, these examinations are sufficient.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Sinclair (Wellington North):

Q. I have a party in my riding who came out under the Three Thousand Family Scheme. I cannot give the name, but the Minister has the letter. This party was accepted, and he sold out his holdings in the Old Country. The allotment had been taken out, and he could not come. They left him over until the next year. He had no work to do, and he said, "What am I going to do?" The Immigration Agent told him that he could come himself, and the family could come next spring, which he did. He worked here all summer with the understanding that he would get his money back. He cannot get it, and the Minister tells me that he is not eligible. The Immigration Agent in the Old Country promised that man that he would get it, and I think it is up to this Immigration Department to give it to him. It is only a matter of \$90. This man is a Scotchman, and you know, we cannot have too many Scotchmen here.—A. I cannot answer that definitely, without having the whole file before me. The first thing to establish, with all due respect to your Scotch friends, is that a promise of that kind was made.

Q. The man who made the promise does not deny it?—A. He does not deny it?

Q. He is in the office on the other side now.—A. He has no business to make a promise like that. There are three parties to this; there is the transportation company, the Old Country Government, and ourselves. The Old Country Government, more than ourselves, protest at doing any back action stuff of that kind. They have their Auditor General—I do not think he is called the Auditor General there; I think he is called the Treasurer—and they refuse to pay out any of that money after a man has left. There is our difficulty. The Inspector making that promise ought to pay it himself.

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. In the business world a firm must make good any representations of their agents, or managers, or superintendents. When your representative admits that he did that, surely the business directors of Canada will stand behind him. You should not evade what a business firm could not evade in a court of this land. If your agent makes a mistake—he is your agent, you have appointed him, you trained and educated him—he is your representative, and you have to stand behind him.—A. Up to a point, that is a good argument.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. I was unavoidably absent during the early part of the discussion today. The last time you were on the stand you made a distinction regarding European immigration. You described a certain line. As I understand it, your proposition was that any man coming from above the so-called line was at liberty to come into Canada on his own, with no assistance from the Canadian Government, provided he was not a criminal, and was physically fit?—A. Yes.

Q. Below the supposed line, there was a distinction. A man was only accepted from that part of Europe, or North Africa, as the case may be, provided he was coming for farm employment, or as a domestic. I am given to understand that there were a certain number admitted from below the line, who were not domestics, and who were not, or did not claim to be going upon the farms?—A. Yes.

Q. When you come before the Committee again, would you come supplied with the information as to the number of men who have been admitted during the last three years?—A. You mean, non-farmers?

Q. Who were non-farmers, or not domestic servants, and who came from that portion of Europe lying south of the line?—A. I will be very glad to do that.

Mr. Ross (Moose Jaw): For the last fifteen years.

Mr. ARTHURS: I will accept that amendment. Also why they were admitted, so far as classes may be concerned. I want to know if there is any particular reason for allowing them in. I do not think it is in your power to give us that for fifteen years, as I do not think the regulations were in existence at that time. (*See productions at page 766 post.*)

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. Regarding the regulations of the immigration officer, in connection with immigrants from different parts of Europe, some of them have spoken to me that they were rigidly examined, had to show their money, and all the rest of it, at the port of entry, while others did not have to go through any such examination. If that is the case, would the immigrant, who went through this examination at the port of entry, be examined as to his physical condition, and his monetary position prior to coming to the Canadian port? I think that is a matter that should be cleared up?—A. Any immigrant coming from the Continent, must be vizaed by the Canadian officer on the Continent, and, of necessity, if he were in that class—I forget just what it is, but we will assume, for the minute, that it is Roumania—he must bring \$250 from his country of origin. I would have to look up the Order in Council to give you the exact rating. We have found by experience that, although he may have \$250, or perhaps more, when examined by our officer on the Continent, he does not have it when he arrives in Canada. That is why the second examination is held, in that respect, to make sure he has it coming in.

Q. Is there any different regulation for the man who is coming over as an agriculturalist, and for the man who is coming over who has not had agricultural experience, who is a tradesman of some sort, or a mechanic, and who had not been nominated by someone in Canada? Would he have to have more money than the man who was nominated, and coming over to a friend, or some other person, who was providing him with a job immediately he landed?—A. There is no specified money nomination for the immigrant from the continent. He must satisfy us that he is able to look after himself, and care for himself when he comes here. If he satisfies our officer that he can do that, he is admitted to the country. Speaking of tradesmen, or farmers coming to assured employment, it depends on the time of the year. If a man were coming in October, we will say, from France, and was a mechanic, or a machinist of some kind, I would require that he should have more money than if he were coming in in the spring of the year, when he would be more likely to secure a position within a week or two, rather than in the fall, when, perhaps, it would be more difficult. He needs something to carry him over, and tide him over.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Regulations have been in force right along describing who shall be barred, since 1912 or 1913?—A. Since 1910.

Q. The information asked for by Mr. Arthurs covers a ten-year period?

Mr. ARTHURS: I was only asking for a three-year period.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Mr. Arthurs can ask for three years, but I am asking for fifteen years. Ten years is enough, as far as I am concerned, but I do not think you can limit it to three years.

The WITNESS: It is understood that what I am bringing to you is the declared occupation of that person. I am bringing you the figures, as we have them on our records of admission. If you want me to cover the exceptions—we will take the \$250 period, when it applied to everybody, in 1920 or 1921—it would mean going into thousands and thousands of files.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. I understand that, up to a comparatively recent period, a man who came in with \$250 in his possession could come in for any employment, practically. That regulation has been changed. That is why I mentioned three years. I do not care whether it is three, five or ten years, but I want to know how these men come in who are not farm employees, or who do not pretend to be, or are not domestic servants, and on whose volition they were allowed to enter Canada, and how many were admitted?

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I suggest that we also want to know how it was that those who did not possess the \$250 qualification came into Canada.

Mr. ARTHURS: I have no objection to that at all.

The WITNESS: That will mean pulling out thousands and thousands of files.

Mr. ARTHURS: I do not think the Minister of National Defence knows just how far his suggestion goes. I can give you one case in point. I had a case up in my riding of a man who came in under the \$250 money clause, or rather started to come in during the war. He arrived at Ellis Island, New York, from Italy. Between the time that he had left Italy, and the time he arrived at Ellis Island, Italian money had dropped down, so that he did not have anything like \$250, although he had a very large sum when he left Italy. This man's friends wired a thousand dollars, or some large sum, to Ellis Island, but the Americans refused to accept it. This shows how the \$250 regulation worked out, and how difficult it would be for the Department to follow it out. I assume that the deputy will have great difficulty in that regard, and, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to limit myself to a three, five, six, or any number of years. Since 1921, I think, would be about fair.

The WITNESS: There would be three tables. Colonel Ralston has suggested ten years; Mr. Ross suggested fifteen. Am I to bring three tables?

Mr. ARTHURS: I want to know the number who came in contrary to the ordinary regulations, regardless of whether it is above or below the line. The number who came, contrary to the ordinary regulations of the Department either from above or below the line.

Mr. CAHAN: It is close to one o'clock, and I think we might adjourn the examination of Mr. Egan. I would like to have the motion which I moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Stewart, put before the meeting.

Witness retired.

Motion agreed to.

The Committee adjourned until Thursday, March 15, at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, March 21, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock A.M., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

W. J. EGAN, recalled:

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Mr. Egan, can you tell the committee at the present time as to how and by whom the distinction is made between preferred and non-preferred continental countries? Is it done by order in council, or is it done by administrative orders?—A. It is not done by order in council. It was a practice carried on after the change in 1922 to the occupational certificates. As a matter of fact, before the amendment in 1922 removing from the monied and other requirements which brought about the change by dropping the money and bringing in the occupational qualification, it had been decided to carry on the practice of admitting people from preferred countries. There is considerable correspondence in connection with it in evidence on the file showing that was actually the principle which was to be kept in practice.

Q. It not having been done by order in council, then I suppose it was done by order of the Minister of Immigration?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It was not a practice established by you as deputy, or some of the officials?—A. No, sir.

Q. It was a practice established by the executive head of the department, the Minister of Immigration?—A. That is correct, sir.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. And it appears in that pamphlet which you issued that, in practice, certain countries of Europe are preferred countries?—A. To which pamphlet do you refer?

Q. The pamphlet you issued in reference to immigration matters.—A. Yes.

Q. This was not done without anybody knowing it?—A. No, it has been in practice. There are two references to it, sir, in this pamphlet and I shall have to take the time to go over the pamphlet to find them.

Q. I think it is in reference to regulation.—A. Yes. In that pamphlet published a year and a half ago and distributed throughout the country. Before being produced in pamphlet form and distributed, a series of articles had appeared in the Canadian press from one end of Canada to the other. Speaking of the regulation in one part of that booklet, we say:

A general regulation P.C. 183 known as the occupational test provides for the admission of persons of certain occupations and of others of certain relationships. The occupations are farmers, farm labourers and house workers. The relationships are wife and unmarried children; parents and unmarried brothers and sisters of any person legally resident in Canada.

Exceptions to this general rule are made in the case of British subjects entering Canada from Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Irish Free State, Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

South Africa and the United States of America. Exceptions are also made in the case of United States citizens entering Canada from the United States and, in practice, of citizens of certain countries of north-western Europe. All immigrants must be coming to assured employment or have sufficient means to maintain themselves until employment is secured.

So you see it was in practice. I made that statement in this particular pamphlet.

Q. That refers to what we are speaking of as preferred countries?—A. Yes, exactly.

Q. How long has that practice been in force—approximately?—A. To my knowledge, since 1910. I say 1910 because I am thinking of a casual review of the files four years ago, but positively since 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922,—right along.

Q. I mean the practice with regard to treating certain countries in the northern part of Europe differently from other parts of Europe further south.—A. It has been in practice to my mind all the time.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Or only since 1923?—A. Oh no, sir. As I said at the beginning, I remember distinctly seeing some correspondence from the Minister, confidential and otherwise, to the old country, in fact, to the High Commissioner. This was before the amendment came into force, pointing out that certain countries would be and were considered preferred in that respect.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. How could they be preferred when it was only a monetary test?—A. They might not have the money.

Q. They were admitted anyway?—A. They were very often admitted when they did not have the money; they may have been living in certain countries, not their own, and not have the proper passports.

Q. That money test is made by order-in-council?—A. Yes.

Q. How could the Minister go behind the order-in-council?—A. It was a practice in vogue, and he did it, and not in any isolated cases at all, but in hundreds of cases. It was done all the time.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. That is when the monetary test was in vogue?—A. Yes.

Q. There were two requirements previous to the order-in-council of 1922?—A. Yes.

Q. One monetary test and the other a passport regulation?—A. Yes.

Q. And you tell us the practice was to disregard the money test sometimes, or the passport regulations, particularly in connection with the countries of northern Europe?—A. Yes, all countries in Europe.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Can you tell us anything with regard to Australia and New Zealand bringing in foreigners from Europe?—A. Only in a general way.

Q. Do they allow all classes to come in, or what are their regulations?—A. I cannot answer you specifically or positively, but I know in a general way they do not allow general immigration of that kind, only under very guarded conditions and for certain districts at certain times.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Have you been able to prepare the statistical statement which you promised, showing in recent years the number of immigrants coming from
[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, May 10, 1928.

W. J. EGAN called.

Witness:

In the evidence which I gave at the beginning of the review by the Committee in connection with the medical examination, I cited some of the reasons which brought about the present arrangement. On one occasion, on page 405, No. 14 of the Minutes dated Thursday, May 3rd, 1928, Mr. Vallance asked the following question:

As a great colonization body—either of the transportation companies being great colonizers—were you or any members of your organization now engaged in the recruiting of British colonists asked to express an opinion regarding the regulation or regulations before they were put into force; that is, when the department issues a new regulation is there any co-operation between the bodies interested in immigration? Are you asked for your opinion as to the regulations, or does the department simply create the regulations and just hand them to you without any consideration on your part?

Colonel Dennis replied as follows:

As regards the existing regulations, myself or any member of the department were not consulted with regard to that, before they were promulgated. Our first notice of them was in the official receipt of them after they had been put in force by the department.

I am not questioning Colonel Dennis's answer, but I feel that the Committee would like to have the history of a little more than the cases I cited, in connection with the present organization, and I am handing to you for your consideration this letter, dated at Montreal, July 23, 1925, addressed to W. J. Egan, Esq., Deputy Minister, Department of Immigration and Colonization, Ottawa, Ont., signed by William Ballantyne, Steamship General Passenger Agent, Canadian Pacific Railway; L. S. Tobin, Passenger Manager, White Star and White Star-Dominion Line, and F. J. McClure, Passenger Manager, Cunard and Anchor-Donaldson Lines, which reads as follows:

IMMIGRATION

The steps taken recently by the United States Government Immigration Department, to place Civil and Medical Inspectors in Europe for the complete inspection of aliens destined to the United States, is undoubtedly familiar to you, and the Canadian Port Steamship Lines have watched with interest this progressive measure on the part of the U. S. Government.

This is not a new subject to you, as the matter was fully discussed with the Minister of Immigration and Officers of the Department some years ago, when your Department decided to send Civil Inspectors to a number of the ports in Europe to assist in the inspection of immigrants to Canada. At that time, a complete inspection both medical and civil was stressed by the Steamship Lines, but there were then difficulties of providing the medical inspection abroad.

Now that the United States Government has embarked on this plan, beginning with Great Britain and the Irish Free State, it is urged by the Canadian Port Steamship Lines that Canada take advantage of this decision, and consider a similar inspection, starting with Great Britain and the Irish Free State.

It is thought that steps might be taken immediately to obtain a report of the working of the U.S. Government inspections, which were commenced on the 20th inst. at London, Liverpool, Southampton, Glasgow, Belfast, Dublin and Cobh, and that probably the Department of Public Health, to which a copy of this communication is being sent, may see the advisability of sending one of their officers to investigate the matter, and report to the Deputy Minister his findings.

We are sure that you realize the importance and value of this forward step, as a help to immigration for Canada, and undoubtedly in time the plan can be extended to the other European countries. With this plan in effect for U.S. destined passengers landing at Canadian ports it would undoubtedly reflect unfavourably and cause adverse criticism on the part of Canadian destined passengers who are obliged to undergo inspection and consequent detention.

The Lines respectfully urge that this matter be considered with a view to placing it in effect for Canada for the next season of Immigration. That is signed by the three parties I have already named.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. What date is that—A. July 23rd, 1925.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. You considered when you put this new regulation into effect that you were acting in harmony with the wishes of those men representing the transportation companies?—A. Absolutely. I am just going to submit something further, to show you that.

The next point.— (Reading):

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, OTTAWA

OTTAWA, May 9, 1927.

Memorandum:

A conference was held in the Deputy Minister's Office on the 7th instant, to discuss medical inspection overseas. The following were present:

Department of Immigration and Colonization: Hon. Robert Forke, Mr. W. J. Egan, Mr. F. C. Blair, Mr. A. L. Jolliffe.

Department of Health: Dr. D. A. Clark, Dr. J. D. Page, Dr. H. D. Jeffs.

Canadian Pacific Railway: Mr. Walter Maughan, Mr. W. G. Annable, Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.

Swedish American Line: Arne Holquist.

French Line: A. Labelle.

Holland America Line: Fred M. Vaz.

North German Lloyd: P. Stenz, J. Eykman.

White Star Line: H. Bjorklund.

Canadian National: J. S. McGowan, A. A. Gardiner.

Cunard, Anchor and Anchor-Donaldson Lines: F. J. McClure, A. Randles.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Civil inspection was not discussed in any way. An announcement was made to the transportation companies of what had been decided upon and the companies were asked for their views. The general feeling of the meeting seemed to be that the Government has in this matter taken a very important step. A good many questions were asked as to how medical inspection would be carried out. Dr. Jeffs explained that in the British Isles it is proposed to issue an Identification Card to those examined, which Identification Card will be valid for three months. On the Continent the medical examination is to take place just prior to sailing. The question was asked about the application of this new arrangement to Scandinavian countries and we replied that nothing has yet been decided upon there, but the matter is under advisement.

Dr. Jeffs explained what his Department had in mind regarding the number of officers and the methods of inspection. He stated that one officer would be at the district headquarters and that in the more important districts two travelling officers would be available and that these would follow a fixed circuit of inspectional points, so that with the three months period in which examination might take place, there would be comparatively little need for any person to travel any distance to see the medical officer.

The steamship companies promise their heartiest co-operation in making the new arrangement effective and it is understood the new arrangement will come into effect when the Department of Health is able to secure the appointment of qualified officers.

(Sgd.) F. C. BLAIR,
Assistant Deputy Minister.

Now, this is my own memorandum, just an aid so as to give you the sequence when you are giving consideration to your report. (Reading):

Medical inspection by roster doctors had not proved satisfactory. A considerable number of British migrants who had received a clear medical certificate from roster doctors were still certified at ports of entry by Canadian medical examiners as mentally defective, afflicted with infectious diseases such as tuberculosis, etc., serious organic disease and other physical defects. In many cases the administration of the law involved serious hardship.

The main reasons for the new system of medical inspection may be summarized as follows:—

(1) To conduct a medical inspection as near the home of the migrant as possible so that families particularly might be assured before breaking up their homes that there would be no question regarding their entry to Canada instead of being rejected at the Canadian port of entry and subject to the humiliation of being deported to their former homes, after having expended their slender savings in transportation and probably with little prospect of securing employment.

(2) The roster doctor charged \$2.50 for examination. This means that 50,000 migrants would contribute \$125,000 to British doctors. It was considered that this examination should be a free service by Canadian Government doctors so that these migrants would be in possession of the above amount upon their arrival in Canada.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

(3) Many complaints have been submitted to the Department by provincial and municipal authorities and other public bodies against the former system of medical inspection which involved not only examination by roster doctors but also line inspection at the ports of entry which necessarily did not contribute a reasonably thorough medical inspection.

And I beg to submit another memorandum to you, regarding bearing of medical examination on cancellations. I am bringing that in here, because there has been so much talk about cancellations on account of medical examination established overseas. (Reading):

It has been suggested in the course of the inquiry that the high percentage of intending migrants who cancel their applications is due to the present system of medical inspection and difficulties attendant thereon.

Since record is not maintained of prospects which are not brought to successful conclusion, the suggestion must be in the nature of a generalization which cannot be met by statistical record. The Department knows, however, its experience in cases which are completed and subsequently cancelled after much trouble and money has been expended, and there is no evidence to date to support the argument that this year's cancellations are on a higher pro rate basis than other preceding years when the roster doctor examination was in force. It is too early, however, to make a fair comparison from figures, as cancellations are not in general notified to Ottawa until later on when the London staff has time to deal with business not of an immediate pressing nature.

Below will be found some figures relating to the question of cancellation, which will demonstrate that this is an unfortunate circumstance incidental to all immigration activity. It is, in point of fact, one of the most disheartening features of the work to those engaged upon it. In the month of March last the London office dealt with 473 applications for inclusion under the 3,000 Family Scheme. Forty-seven of these cases were rejected by the Canadian or British authorities. Forty-seven either withdrew or were transferred to other schemes, and a balance of 379 were actually approved. These 379 cases had been the subject of at least one interview in each case by a Departmental Official, and probably two. Their papers had been completed by the agencies in the provinces, despatched to London, reviewed and approved by a Senior Official of the Department, specially posted in London for the purpose, and yet on completion of all this work there were 30 subsequent cancellations, whereas only 4 were rejected by the medical authorities. Thus, out of a total of 473 cases dealt with there was a net approval of 345.

Under what is known as the 3,000 Family Scheme, inaugurated in 1925, there have been 3,830 cases approved by both governments, and of these 854, or 22.3 per cent, have withdrawn after approval. A short statement showing the approvals and cancellations by years since the inception of this scheme is attached. It will be noted that these withdrawals have no relation whatever to the system of medical examination whether by roster doctor or departmental official, and it would be quite impossible to enumerate the reasons for them which are spread over a field of almost every possible variety.

In sailings under the railway quotas last year the London office issued for the two companies a total of 5,137 warrants. Seven hundred and seventy-one of these warrants were subsequently cancelled because the persons concerned withdrew for some reason or another. Here again there is no question of medical examination or of the difficulty attendant

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

thereon, because these 771 warrants were actually issued and the cases ready for sailing, medical examination being complete. This was under the roster system.

Similarly, from January 1, 1927, to December 31, 1927, there were despatched to London for development there 2,276 nominations made by residents of Canada for residents of Great Britain. Presumably a nomination is not made from Canada without some knowledge on the part of the person residing in Great Britain that such a nomination is going to be made. In almost every case probably the nomination has arisen at the instance of the person residing in Great Britain, and yet of the 2,276 nominations that were despatched to England in the period under review 636 had to be cancelled because of some change in the intention of the prospective migrants. In addition to the 636 there were 223 rejected for civil or medical reasons.

It will be noted that with the exception of the figures given above regarding the Family Scheme for the month of March, 1928, all other figures relate to the period in which the Roster doctor examination was in vogue. For the first four months of the year 1928 under the Departmental examination 1,290 nominations have been referred to London, and of these we have so far received record only of cancellations or rejections in 222 cases. There is nothing, therefore, in these figures to support the belief that the percentage of cancellations is higher this year than it was last, but from the figures as quoted above it will readily be seen that cancellation by migrants of their intention to proceed to Canada will always take place on a considerable scale by the conditions of medical inspection ever so favourable.

3,000 BRITISH FAMILY SETTLEMENT SCHEME

APPLICATIONS APPROVED BY YEARS

Years	Approved	Applications Cancelled prior to sailing	Percentage cancelled
1925	710	244	34.4
1926	1,420	378	26.6
1927	1,298	176	13.6
1928	402	56	13.9
Totals	3,830	854	22.3

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Do you investigate these cases that do not come to find out the reason why?—A. Not particularly unless the officer is going through the district. But, as a rule, they will tell you "Oh, we made up our minds not to go," or some other reason. As a rule they do not give you the real information. Our agents do report on it from time to time.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until 11 o'clock a.m., May 11, 1928.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, May 18, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

W. J. EGAN recalled.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Mr. Egan, you are familiar with section 4 of the Immigration Act?—
A. I know it.

Q. I will read it. (Reading):

4. (1) The Minister may issue a written permit authorizing any person to enter Canada, or having entered or landed in Canada to remain therein without being subject to the provisions of this Act. Such permit shall be in the form A of the schedule to this Act, and shall be expressed to be in force for a specified period only, but it may at any time be extended or cancelled by the Minister in writing. Such extension or cancellation shall be in the form AA of the schedule to this Act.

(2) A return of all such permits with particulars and names therefor, issued during the year, shall be made by the Minister to Parliament within thirty days of its meeting.

That is the only section, is it not, of the Act or of the regulations which refers to the permission to enter Canada under a permit.—A. Yes.

Q. We had evidence in regard to the so-called permits which have otherwise been described as "Letters of permission to enter Canada," having been issued by the Department of Immigration. Those letters of admission, familiarly known in ordinary parlance as "permits" are, I understand, issued under P.C. 183, an order in council of the 31st of January, 1923?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And the special clause under which they are issued is No. 7 of that order in council, which reads as follows: "A person who has satisfied the Minister that his labour or service is required in Canada" may be admitted? That is a special clause under which the so-called permits may be issued?—
A. That is the special clause under which these letters of admission admit people who are not covered under sections 2 and 3 of P.C. 183.

Now, I want to get this clear before the Committee. This P.C. 183 of the 31st day of January, 1923, reads as follows:—

From and after the 15th of February, 1923, and until otherwise ordered, the landing in Canada of immigrants of all classes and occupations is hereby prohibited, except as hereinafter provided:—

The immigration officer in charge may notwithstanding the provisions of P.C. 23 of the 7th of January, 1914, permit to land in Canada any immigrant who otherwise complies with the provisions of the Immigration Act, if it is shown to his satisfaction that such immigrant is,—

(1) A bona fide agriculturist entering Canada to farm and has sufficient means to begin farming in Canada.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

(2) A bona fide farm labourer entering Canada to follow that occupation and has reasonable assurance of employment.

(3) A female domestic servant entering Canada to follow that occupation and has reasonable assurance of employment.

(4) The wife or child under 18 years of age, of any person legally admitted to and resident in Canada, who is in a position to receive and care for his dependents.

No. 5 is for the special admission of United States citizens, and No. 6 is for the admission of British subjects from the British Dominions, and then No. 7 is as I have read, "A person who has satisfied the Minister that his labour or service is required in Canada." Can you point out to me any other clause in P.C. 183 or any other order in council under which these special letters of admission may possibly be authorized by the Minister or the Deputy Minister, or by the immigration official in charge?—A. No, I can not.

Q. And with regard to this so-called application for permits which are applications for letters of admissions: those are all made to your department under P.C. 183, clause 7?—A. The applications are not made under P.C. 183; the applications are made in general, but we apply P.C. 183 to them.

Q. That answers my question, and if the applicants knew the law they would be informed that the application could only be granted to prospective immigrants as coming under clause 7, "A person who has satisfied the Minister that his labour or service is required in Canada"?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, with regard to the applications which are granted by the issue of letters of admission under that section: a list of them is not laid before Parliament at each session?—A. No, sir.

Q. Those letters of admission, as I understand from the evidence given by the present Minister, are always issued by you as Deputy Minister?—A. Not issued by me. I instruct the Divisional Commissioner to issue them.

Q. They are issued then, as I understand it, under your instructions, but the specific letter of admission is signed by one of your subordinate officers?—A. The Divisional Commissioner.

Q. In Canada how many divisional commissioners are there who issue such letters?—A. Three.

Q. What are their names and where are they located?—A. Mr. Fraser in the eastern division, Mr. Gellay in Winnipeg, and Mr. Skinner in Vancouver.

Q. Mr. Fraser in the eastern division has his office with you?—A. In Ottawa.

Q. Now, when these officers issue such letters of admission—I will adhere to that for the purpose of preventing any misunderstanding—do they not return duplicate copies of those letters of admission to be filed in your office at Ottawa?—A. Oh, yes, from the other divisions.

Q. From the other divisions?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. So that during each month, as such letters of admission are issued by the divisional commissioner, copies thereof, or duplicates thereof, are returned and filed with your department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Therefore, you have knowledge in your department of the number of such letters of admission issued from month to month?—A. Yes, sir. Well, not from month to month. May I explain, that I have quarterly returns submitted to me, that is, of the total number, but one could trace up the record from month to month. However, I have not that on file here.

Q. In any questions which I ask you, Mr. Egan, you are quite at liberty to give any reasonable explanation you may have. I simply want to get at the facts?—A. Yes, I understand.

Q. Now, in each case, that is, before the Division Commissioner grants such a letter of admission, he is assumed to have made inquiry and have reported that the labour or service of the prospective immigrant is required in Canada?—

A. No, sir. There is no letter issued under section 7 unless I have had an investigation made of the conditions surrounding the application, the original entry of the applicant if he is from overseas, or an investigation of the home conditions, or, in other words, the establishment of the possibility of receiving, or of investigating the labour to which he is being brought, taking into consideration that the people who want to employ this man from overseas must fully realize that we can give it no consideration if the man is, in any way, going to affect the labour conditions of that vicinity—

Q. Well, then, I understand, Mr. Egan— —A. Will you allow me to finish? Beyond that, I do issue letters under section 7—I suppose it is almost infra dig— where a member of Parliament—that is, of course, within the last two years under the instructions of this report—assumes responsibility. We issue these without an investigation, but only where a man of standing, we will say, a man of character, has submitted his request, and if prepared to assume responsibility to us for the claims submitted, and all that has been suggested in the application, as being genuine. In that case, that is beyond my investigation.

Q. You can make your observations after answering my question. Therefore, you, as Deputy Minister of Immigration in the first place assume responsibility with respect to investigation of every prospective immigrant coming in under clause 7, except those who are recommended to you by certain persons of standing?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, that departmental practice of admitting prospective immigrants on the representation of some person of standing, without special inquiry by you, or by your officers on your behalf, has been in vogue for what length of time?—A. Well, under section 7, since it came into force.

Q. It came into force on the 21st of January, 1923, and then it was amended.—A. Clause 7 came in in April of 1926, sir.

Q. Clause 7 came in in April, 1926?—A. Yes, sir, under 534.

Q. As published in the regulations, I see no amendment of 1926. I would like to have that definite. Just fix the date?—A. April 8th, 1926.

Q. April 8th, 1926?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Just so as to make it clear, that Section, or Clause 7 of Order 183 came into operation by an amending order passed in 1926, on what date?—A. April 8th.

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. What is the number?—A. 534.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. That 534 amendment has not been published?—A. Unfortunately, it has just been embodied here.

Q. Well, that answers my purpose. What is the date again?—A. April 8th, sir, 1926.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I think eight was amended too.

Mr. CAHAN: I am just interested in this, and I do not want to get off it. Perhaps I might ask whether the Deputy Minister has a copy of that Order in Council, and if he will lay it on the table.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Now, Mr. Egan, since April 8th, 1926, I understand from you that under Clause 7 which says, "A person who has satisfied the Minister that his labour or service is required in Canada," a certain number of proposed immigrants have been named or nominated to your department by persons other than officials of your department?—A. Yes.

Q. And on the responsibility of the nominating parties, your department has issued the letters of admission?—A. Yes, sir.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. In every case, Mr. Egan?—A. You mean all of those letters?

Q. Yes?—A. No, no.—

Q. The witness is conveying the impression that in every case where this party has been nominated, the applicant has been permitted to come in. Is that a fact, Mr. Egan?—A. That was not what I intended to convey. I think the question was different to that. That was not the question you asked.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Now, Mr. Egan, I will give you, in a moment ample opportunity to explain. Among the persons who have been deemed by your department as worthy of credence, and as having responsibility in such matters, are members of Parliament, who have made such nominations?—A. Yes.

Q. When nominations have been made by others than members of Parliament, have you granted letters of admission on such nominations in every case, or have you made them subject to further inquiry on your behalf through your officials?—A. Always, unless—and not always even in the case of the member of Parliament or anybody of standing—and by that I do not mean any exalted person, I mean some reputable person; it may be anybody, it may be a magistrate or it may be the mayor of a town—

Q. I am confining my immediate question to the nominations made by those other than members of Parliament?—A. Are they granted at once, do you mean, without investigation?

Q. Well, do you make, or cause to be made on your behalf, as Deputy Minister and Chief Executive of the department, an inquiry into the fitness of these persons who are so nominated?—A. Always.

Q. So that with regard to nominations, and to nominations made by outside parties since April 8th, 1926, you as the permanent executive of the department assume full responsibility for the inquiry made, and for the finding that this person's labour or service is required in Canada?—A. Oh, no, not by any means.

Q. Well, then, how do you distinguish in the matter of responsibility—and I am not including members of Parliament at the moment—persons of standing and integrity and responsibility throughout the country who make those nominations, and your own executive responsibility in granting the letters of admission? Do you assume responsibility?—A. When I said, "Oh, no," I understood you to ask if I undertook responsibility for all admitted under Section 7, because I was the Chief Executive Officer; in so far as I have handled them direct, without other instructions from my Minister, yes.

Q. Oh, well, that is fair?—A. I do, I come to the conclusion that what a man submits to me is a fair proposition. However, I very seldom say "yes" at once to anybody, because I want to investigate the record to start with. But, I come to a conclusion, we will assume, when a member of Parliament—one hates to name a district, because one might be coupling some one, but call it Hell's Corners, if you wish, or something else of that kind; a member of Parliament comes in and he says to me, "Mr. Egan, there is a Greek restaurant keeper in my town. He has been there for twenty years. He is a naturalized citizen of the country; his business has grown to some importance. I am just trying to think of one case now. His sister, older than himself, remained in Greece. She has died, and her husband is dead, and there is a boy there whom he would like to have with him. He has promised in his communications to his sister on the other side, that he would like to have her boy. And, he will say to me, that is, the member of Parliament, now, I know whereof I speak, this is genuine. I look up the records first of all, getting the name of the ship that he came on, because a member of Parliament is liable to be deceived by some one. So I

look up the record to see when he came into the country, and if he came into the country legally. I do that before accepting a proposition of that kind, from a member of Parliament, or the mayor of a municipality.

Q. All right, just a moment though, Mr. Egan. My mind is a single acting sort of mind. I am coming down to members of Parliament, but I am dealing now with responsible citizens other than members of Parliament who make nominations for proposed admission of immigrants to your department. In those cases, I understand you to say that despite the fact that the nomination has been made by a person of standing and responsibility, you make some inquiry?—A. I must make an inquiry if he is some one coming from the Old Country, that is, if the friend or relative, we will say, is from Roumania, then I must satisfy myself that he entered the country legally. We look up our own records. He must tell us the ship he came in on, and then we follow it up.

Q. Now, dealing with that, you make some investigation from your own records?—A. Yes, as to the legal entry of the applicant.

Q. As to the legal entry of the applicant?—A. Yes.

Q. But, as to the representations that the labour or service of this proposed immigrant is required in Canada, for that you trust the representations made by the person domiciled here, whom you regard as being of standing and responsibility?—A. It is very hard to say, because it is only flashing across my mind now, and I am only trying to give you an approximate figure, but I do not suppose, in the last two years it would be fifty individuals that I have not investigated the conditions surrounding and sent an officer out to investigate, to make inquiry, to my mind, perhaps the mayor of the municipality or the magistrate of a city who happens to know some one, or something of that kind.

Q. That gives an explanation. Now, we are dealing with those persons who have been nominated by persons of standing and responsibility, domiciled in this country, other than members of Parliament; I am dealing with those?—A. If I may be permitted, I would like to make it clear, it is not a nomination, it is a relation of the man overseas who does the nominating, and he is the individual who assumes responsibility for it; he does not do the nominating.

Q. Let us get some other word that is not doubtful. The matter is brought to the attention of the department first, usually by some person in this country?—A. Yes.

Q. That person brings to your department a document, usually in writing?—A. Yes, brings the application, but not always; he comes in, tells his story and takes away two application forms, and I tell him to get them filled up.

Q. Then in the course of making out these so-called applications a document is sent in written by the applicant?—A. No. That document is signed by a relative of the party in Montreal or Winnipeg, or wherever you wish. The man who sponsors it writes a separate letter to me.

Q. Is there any doubt about the meaning of the word "nomination," when I deal with those who sponsor the application?—A. No; I cannot at least see any side lines to it at all.

Q. Now, with regard to all applications which have been made to your department since April 8, 1926, and which you have granted under clause 7 of the Order in Council to which I have referred, you in every case assume responsibility for the admission of those who have been sponsored by those other than members of Parliament, do you not?—A. Yes, that is, for those that are issued, not for all applications.

Q. I am dealing with those letters of admission; in each of those cases you have made either by yourself, through your officers or through these sponsors, an enquiry which satisfied you that the service of this applicant was required in Canada, under that subsection?—A. Yes, those I have mentioned.

Q. Coming down, you say that of that class sponsored by representative parties through members of Parliament—you have since this Order in Council

came into force on April 8, 1926, admitted about fifty applicants, in which you made no special enquiry yourself?—A. While I said fifty, of course I am just giving you an approximate figure; it may be sixty, it may be forty. I cannot visualize anything beyond fifty of that kind.

Q. I am not trying to confuse you at all?—A. I know that, sir.

Q. Now, with regard to the other class, do I understand from your previous statement that you accept members of Parliament as sponsors for applicants?—A. At times.

Q. At times?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you confine such sponsorship to one particular party, or do you accept as such sponsors members of Parliament on both sides of the House?—A. I never play favourites, sir.

Q. I understand from that, that you accept members of Parliament as members of Parliament without regard to political affiliation?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you met in practice, in the administration of your department, or has your minister approved any practice whereby a certain number of these permits would be granted to prospective immigrants when sponsored by a member of Parliament, as to the number which each member of Parliament would be allowed to sponsor?—A. No, sir, not quite in the way you have put it.

Q. All right, put it in your own way?—A. Of necessity, with our Act as it is, this thing is so large that you would have to spread out a little to make it clearly understood; but let me put it in this way: this is more or less a concession to meet certain conditions which must inevitably occur where you have people coming to a certain stage of life when they are prepared to do something for their people on the other side, and you have to meet it, no matter what your law is, up to a point, and we are directed in section 7— yet you do not want it to become too big an avenue for anything and everything that is submitted, because your immigration policy is bringing enough, and some claim too much, through these particular channels. Therefore if I were to answer the question the way it comes to me—I want to make this clear, that on the evidence I have that comes to me for each individual case sponsored by members of Parliament—you take a member of Parliament for a certain district, he will have within his particular constituency perhaps twenty thousand or twenty-five thousand of certain people in a given city. Of necessity he is going to be burdened more with that particular type of man than the man in a country constituency, and he will press individual cases, because he is pressed. But I have tried to keep it within bounds, within my own judgment, without setting up any quota proposition or anything of that kind, or numbers, and I have had to say, “No, you have gone far enough, because if you get your particular people here somebody else will be making an enquiry,” and a man may come two or three days during the session of parliament, particularly if he is in the eastern division. In that way only has it approached anything like along the lines you are suggesting.

Q. That is, that there is no quota for individual members of parliament?—A. Oh no, absolutely not.

Q. Now, with regard to these applications which are sponsored by members of parliament, do you or your officers on your behalf make any investigation other than the representations made by members of parliament to you with regard to whether or not the labour or service of such applicant is required in Canada?—A. I do not quite get your meaning; for those I accept a sponsor for—is that what you mean?

Q. Certain applications are made?—A. Yes.

Q. Sponsored by members of parliament?—A. Yes.

Q. In regard to those which are sponsored by members of parliament, what is the extent of the personal inquiry which you make or which you cause to

be made on your behalf, by your officials, into the representations made by the member, and as to whether the labour or service of this particular applicant is required in Canada?—A. So much will depend upon the type of application. As members of parliament have told me very often, I was quite restrictive because I did not accept their word at once for their sponsoring of the conditions surrounding them. I told them that I thought that while I had no doubt as to what they had submitted, my experience was that they were not always told the truth by applicants, and that I felt I must make an inquiry.

Q. Is it more general in such cases, dealing with those sponsored by members of parliament—is it more general that you make an inquiry than that you do not?—A. Yes, I would say so, that is, with some members of parliament.

Q. You would regard some more than others?—A. No, sir. Do not put it in that way at all, because that is not what I mean to say at all. There are some members of parliament who bring me more individual cases, because their constituencies are so constituted that of necessity they are pressed to bring more.

Q. That is to say, you have with some members of parliament found more pressing demands from their constituents than other members of parliament?—A. That is the story they tell me.

Q. In those cases in which the applications are sponsored by members of parliament, do you in each case bring the matter of the granting of letters of admission to the notice of and secure the approval of the Minister or Acting Minister of the Department, or do you deal with them on your own responsibility?—A. Under section 7, you mean, sir?

Q. Yes?—A. Under the authority of the Minister, who has given the instructions of which I have a copy here, I deal with it. One cannot say I deal with them all. The Minister may submit it, but very seldom; he usually sends them to me.

Q. Have you specific instructions from the Minister of your Department with regard to dealing with these applications?—A. Yes.

Q. May I have it filed, and may I see it?—A. Yes. (Reads):

OCTOBER 19, 1926.

Memorandum:—

Mr. W. J. EGAN.

I have given careful consideration to the question of entry by permits and, also, to the question of quotas as arranged in the past.

I am of the opinion that the regulation, P.C. 183, as extended by the amending Order in Council P.C. 534, will give all the latitude required for Canada's needs in respect to labour.

There will, of course, be exceptions from time to time, but these are to be granted by the Minister or Deputy Minister to members of parliament only and are to be limited to cases within their respective constituencies. Furthermore, the member must assume responsibility for the same.

In brief our policy for the future will be:—

1. No quotas.
2. Permits to be issued to members of parliament only for cases within their respective constituencies and only when the members accept responsibility for the genuine character of the same.

(Signed) ROBERT FORKE,

Minister.

Q. Now, with regard to this document containing the instructions of the Minister of October 19th, 1926, if I understand you correctly it refers solely and exclusively to the granting of permits, so-called, or to letters of admission, as we now call them?—A. Yes.

Q. To applicants who are sponsored by members of parliament?—A. Yes.

Q. In that letter—may I look at it, please?—A. Surely.

Q. In that letter, which is signed by "Robert Forke", the Minister, there is this reference:—

I have given careful consideration to the question of entry by permits and, also, to the question of quotas as arranged in the past.

To what does the Minister there refer—"quotas as arranged in the past"?—A. Some years ago before I came into the Department, at the request of—I cannot think of his name at the moment—an explorer, well known in Geneva—Nansen—who had submitted to the Minister of the time, a statement of the conditions surrounding Russian Jews—members of Jewry—who were fugitives to Roumania. He put up an appeal, on behalf of the League of Nations, that something should be done to bring a certain number of these people here and have them established, providing Jewry on its own undertaking would assume the responsibility for their after-care under any and all conditions; and that quota was established and that can be the only quota or any particular renewal of it at the time that the Minister refers to.

Q. And there was a quota with regard to the admission, or as to the number or proportion that might be admitted?—A. No, this was just in that one particular case of fugitives from Roumania.

Q. Now, with that explanation, this letter states that these permits—letters of application—are to be granted by the Minister or the Deputy Minister to members of Parliament only and are to be limited to cases within their respective constituencies?—A. Yes.

Q. Since the date of this letter, October 19th, 1926, when members of Parliament have sponsored an applicant for admission, have you regarded such sponsorship as determining your position giving approval to such admission?—A. Not always.

Q. In a large number of cases you would, I suppose?—A. Well, yes. Yes, and no. With some members, as I told you before, not because they were of any less merit, but because the conditions surrounding them would, what shall I say, mean the entry of too many people of that particular kind, into the country and into city life.

Q. You have referred to that before, that it was because they had more of that type of constituents than the other members. Now, with regard to the granting of letters of admission sponsored by members of Parliament, how many such letters of admission have been granted, sponsored by members of Parliament, since October, 1926?—A. Mr. Coote asked that I submit the same information and I have got it ready. May this be included now, Mr. Coote? It is a statement of admissions authorized by P.C. 534, Section 7, which provides for the admission of a person who has satisfied the Minister that his labour or service is required in Canada: from June, 1926, to June, 1927, inclusive 2,184. Since then I have had quarterly reports submitted. From July, 1927, to September, 1927, 430. From October, 1927, to December, 1927, 290. From January, 1928, to March, 1928, 157.

Q. Have you the total?—A. I can add it up in a minute. 3,061.

By Mr. Spence:

Q. Would that number include those entitled to come in, such as fathers, mothers and brothers?—A. No, that is under Section 7, where there are labourers required.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. That is, the letter of Mr. Forke is dated October 19th, 1926, and you have given the number of admissions from June, 1926 to March, 1928 and your total is 3,061?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, just in order that we may not misunderstand each other; this statement which you have just submitted is headed: "Statement of Admissions Authorized Under P.C. 534, Section 7, which provides for the admission of a person who has satisfied the Minister that his labour or services is required in Canada." And therefore the number of 3,061 comprises the total number that were admitted whether sponsored by a member of Parliament or not, and admissions under Clause 7 of P.C. 183?—A. Yes.

Q. So that members of Parliament are not responsible for the whole 3,061?—A. Well, no they are not.

Q. I did not hear your answer.—A. No, they are not.

Q. Did you make it known generally to members of Parliament that applicants would receive letters of admission on their sponsorship since this letter of October 19th, 1926 was received by you?—A. No, sir. Only as each member approached me; the point there being that he had to assume responsibility for what he submitted and it did not require any special advertising.

Q. Has it been drawn to your attention by complaint or notice of any nature, that members of Parliament were alleged to have used or exercised this discretion for the purpose of obtaining monetary consideration for their intervention in this matter?—A. I have heard that rumour.

Q. Have you received any letters at your Department making that complaint?—A. About members of Parliament?

Q. Yes.—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you, in respect of the administration of this branch, may I call it, of Immigration Service, had any reason to believe or suspect that members of Parliament were sponsoring admissions for the purpose of gain?—A. No, sir, I have never had any such thought in my mind.

Q. When members of Parliament have sponsored an application, is it in respect of a specific application which then or thereupon is submitted to you signed by the applicant for admission?—A. Yes, sir, practically in every case so far as I am concerned.

Q. When you grant letters of admission in response to such written applications signed by a member, how do you dispose of it, or how do you deliver, and to whom do you deliver the letter of admission granted?—A. Are you still speaking of the member of Parliament?

Q. No, the question is general.—A. In some cases, and in most cases—no, I must put it this way: more of the members of Parliament than the outside individuals ask that I shall send the letter of admission—which is really only evidence that there is assured employment here, for the benefit of the officers overseas—they ask that it be sent direct to the applicant more often than anyone else; and otherwise I direct it to the member or to the Mayor, or to the individual who has sponsored the application.

Q. In respect to applications sponsored by members of Parliament, is his sponsorship noted on the application in any way?—A. Absolutely, sir.

Q. It is?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that the letter of admission would contain as well the name of the member of Parliament who sponsored the granting of that admission?—A. No, sir, not the sponsor; but he receives a letter from us when we enclose the Divisional Commissioner's letter of admission to that particular individual, he receives a letter from us telling him of his responsibility in connection with it, which more often than not covers a letter which he has sent assuming these responsibilities and telling of his own investigation into the matter.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. Now, Mr. Egan, how many of these 3,061 letters of admission granted under Clause 7, since June, 1926, have been granted and sponsored by members of Parliament?—A. That I cannot tell you at the moment, but if you will take my estimate of fifty off—or make it one hundred—I cannot tell you, I will have to look it up.

Q. I do not press for an answer now, but I think it might be as well that we should know.—A. How many were given to the members of Parliament?

Q. No, how many of these letters of admission to the number of 3,061, were sponsored by members of Parliament?—A. What are the figures there, sir?

Q. 3,061.—A. Oh, I would say 2,900.

Q. 2,900?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Could you give an estimate as to how that number is divided provincially?—A. No, sir.

Q. You could not do that? I suppose a careful going over your records would give that? I would not expect it off-hand.—A. Well, if I pulled all the files and dug into it, I could, yes, sir.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Could you give an estimate of how many members of Parliament got those 2,900?—A. No, the nearest I can give to that is, that out of curiosity of my own, at one time I kept track and probably 145 members.

Q. That is during the period from June, 1926?—A. Yes, under this clause. 145.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Did your curiosity extend to the point of ascertaining who was highest in the competition and who was lowest?—A. No, I simply kept track of the members who were making inquiries of that kind and it spread to about 145.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Now in order that we may have another view of this, will you tell us when you came to office as Deputy Minister?—A. On October 11th, 1923.

Q. During the three years, or less than three years, from October 1923 to June, 1926, did this same practice obtain of members of Parliament sponsoring applications for admission, or was the letter of October 19th, 1926, something of an innovation?—A. It was an innovation in so far as it confined it practically to members of Parliament. May I explain, in case there is any question as to why I moved away from the members of Parliament and perhaps rented it to fifty or sixty or seventy other individuals; it was that I consulted with my Minister and pointed out that very often a County Judge or some one of that class, would write in and we would have, I thought, to lean in that direction if the records were perfect, and as far as we were concerned the innovation was in confining it to members of Parliament.

Q. Then I understand that this letter of the Hon. Mr. Forke of October 19, 1926, was intended to convey this sponsorship to Members of Parliament for the admission of applicants under clause 7?—A. Yes, the real object being to have somebody of standing assume responsibility without our undertaking the tremendous expense of carrying on investigations, because we felt we were getting enough continental people without.

Q. And did you, when applications were made by other parties, advise them that letters of admission would only be granted when sponsored by Members of Parliament?—A. So much would depend on the applicant. We had too much respect for Members of Parliament to inflict on them some of the people

coming to me, and I simply said "No" to them. If some one of standing, like the Mayor of a town, for instance, would come to me I would tell him "This proposition is extremely limited; we are keeping it down for a very specific reason; however, if you will see your Member of Parliament or your friend in Parliament, or your prospective friend in Parliament, and he sponsors it, I shall be very glad to give it the consideration that he would give it."

Q. As a matter of fact, Mr. Egan, you know that a general notice to the public that Members of Parliament were exercising their discretion in this matter issued directly or indirectly from your Department, did it not?—A. Yes sir, I knew of that.

Q. Then I am correct in assuming that since October 19th, 1926, the responsibility of sponsoring admissions under clause 7 has rested upon Members of Parliament in respect of such applications as were made by those resident or domiciled in their electoral districts?—A. Yes sir.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. The term "Members of Parliament" has been used. I would like to ask if in using the term "Members of Parliament" and "being restricted to Members of Parliament" you mean those who are presently Members of Parliament, or those who have been Members of Parliament in the past, and also do you include in that number who have the special right—if I may say—to make representation or act as sponsors, defeated candidates or those who aspired to be Members of Parliament?—A. Yes, that is why I figured a little higher than the first fifty in making the deduction of the first 186. I took the stand, provided he was not making too many inquiries, that he was a representative citizen of a section of a particular constituency, having been a candidate for parliament. By the way, occasionally I consider Senators as Members of Parliament in that sense, where they have come in and made certain representations.

By Mr. Cahon:

Q. Does the phrase "sponsored by Members of Parliament to the number of 3,061" include the sponsorship of Members of Parliament at the time, defeated candidates at the previous election, and also in some cases those who have been Members of Parliament in times past, but are not now?—A. No, not those who have been Members of Parliament in times past. Well, I say "No"; I can not really say "No" because there were perhaps two or three or four. I always refer them to the present sitting Member irrespective of what side he is on. There is a sort of Free Masonry amongst you—

Q. Supposing a defeated candidate— —A. Ah, yes; a defeated candidate, yes.

Q. —in my constituency should sponsor an admission; do you refer it to me?—A. No. I thought you meant to former Members of Parliament.

Q. But if he were defeated at the last election in the constituency you regard him as still a sort of distributor of patronage in that constituency?—A. Yes, but I am afraid he thinks I limit him a little too much. Most of them do.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. He is included in those whom you recognize as responsible sponsors?—A. Yes.

Mr. JACOBS: He would fall under the heading of "a man of outstanding ability"?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (*Frontenac*): With the accent on the "out".

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Have you prepared a statement showing the number of applicants to whom letters of admission were issued which are sponsored by each Member of Parliament respectively since October 19th, 1926?—A. Issued under my instructions?—A. No.

Q. They are all issued under your instructions?—A. Oh no.

Q. Let me get at this phase of it. I understood you to say that since October 19th, 1926, all of those 3,061 were granted letters of admission under your instructions, in this sense, that whether they were approved by the Minister or not—A. Ah, yes; if you include that, yes.

Q. They were issued by you?—A. Yes.

Q. What proportion of them, or what number of these 3,061 do you decline to take responsibility for, and say that that responsibility rests with the Minister?—A. Do I decline to take responsibility? You mean the instructions he gives me regarding issuing them? We will presume that my Minister sees very few of them. Occasionally he will just say "You had better grant this to this individual". It would not be more than five or six times since we have been in office together. He might simply say "You had better let this go through". It was something I knew nothing of, and it came to him and he simply submitted it to me.

Q. Well, take the number then where the Minister has made the initial representation to you, you issue the letter of admission, solely and exclusively on the responsibility of the Minister?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you do not make any prolonged investigation, or inquiry, as to whether a proposed immigrant meets with the conditions of Clause 7?—A. Always. For the protection of my Minister, when he does instruct in that way, no matter who my Minister may be, if he sends me an application of that kind, and suggests or instruct that it be granted, for his protection, I look up my records, and if perchance the case is not one as represented to him, then I advise him to that effect.

Q. Well, now, I will return to my question. Have you prepared a statement with respect to these 3,061 persons, as to who sponsored each application, and as to the number which each individual sponsored or assumed sponsorship for?—A. I have not anything that I could submit now. I could prepare something of that kind.

Mr. CAHAN: Well, personally, it rests with the Committee, but I think we are getting on so far that it would be wise to prepare that and leave it to the Committee to dispose of.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Have you yourself been approached with offers of monetary consideration for the issuance of such letters of Admission?—A. Have I been approached?

Q. Yes?—A. No, sir.

Q. Well, I will ask you the other question. Have you ever received any monetary consideration personally, in respect of that?—A. No, sir. Not one cent of any kind.

Q. I am asking that question, Mr. Egan, not with the idea of offending you at all?—A. That is all right. Let me take some responsibility now. Not under any circumstances; no one in our Department, that is, all my officers who come under my direct control, my chief officers. It is a crime, a calumny, the way gossip goes around under certain conditions, and there is nothing in it whatsoever, in any way, shape, form or manner.

Q. You are absolutely convinced that neither your senior or subordinate officials, of any class or distinction, are receiving monetary considerations in respect of those permits or letters of Admission?—A. None whatsoever.

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. I would like to move, arising out of what Mr. Cahan stated, that the witness prepare a statement showing the names of members of parliament, or defeated candidates implicated in the issuance of the 3,061.—A. Why implicated?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I did not mean anything by that.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Just add "others" too.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: The names of all those connected with the sponsoring of the 3,061 permits, and the numbers of permits obtained by each.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the motion?
Carried.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. I am going to ask one or two questions. It will not take very long. In view, or in regard to the special privilege which has been given to members of parliament, and the people of Canada, those to whom you refer in sponsoring these applications for admission to the country, in some cases the representation is made direct to the Minister, and he would exercise his judgment, or perhaps submit the matter for your further consideration?—A. Both ways, yes.

Q. You have three Commissioners, one representing the East, one at Winnipeg, and one at Vancouver?—A. Yes.

Q. Do those Commissioners assume the responsibility in their several districts, or to make it more specific— —A. No, sir. Anything under Section 7 must come to me from any Division.

Q. That is, the Commissioner at Vancouver, or at Winnipeg would have to forward to you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He could not, on his own responsibility accept any number of applications?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. There is one point I would like to clear up. Do any of your Commissioners ever issue these letters of Admission, leaving the name of the applicant blank?—A. Under no circumstances.

Q. In every case then, before a letter of Admission goes out, the actual name of the applicant must be inserted in that letter?—A. His name and his age, and the crest stamp of the Department, and the Divisional Commissioner, etc. There is no such thing—that is another thing that has been going the rounds here, Mr. Garland, that we hand out fifty blank forms at a time to John Jones, or someone else—

Q. There is no truth whatever then, in the rumour to that effect?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. There is another point, Mr. Egan, I did not get quite clear. I understood you to state that each of the three Commissioners may issue letters of admission?—A. No. I say that I instruct the three Commissioners. Let us presume that the application is from Saskatchewan, and that it has been approved of. I give him instructions that it should be carried out. I forward those instructions to him. I forward those instructions to the Commissioner in charge of the three Divisional Commissioners, and he forwards the instructions to the Divisional Commissioner, at Winnipeg, say, to issue such and such a letter, under such and such a date for such and such a reason, and he issues the letter then—

Q. That is, the Commissioner at Winnipeg?—A. The Divisional Commissioner issues the letter of which we receive a copy at once.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. In the 3,061, the number issued, is there included in that number letters that may have been issued by other Commissioners outside of Ottawa?—A. Oh, that is the whole thing.

Q. That includes them all?—A. Oh, yes, yes.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Mr. Egan, I believe that P.C. 183 was issued in 1923, was it not?—A. Yes, sir, 31st January, 1923.

Q. In Clause 7 there it states:—

A person who has satisfied the minister that his labour or service is required in Canada.

That is, it allows any person to enter who is required for service here in Canada?—A. Any person who has satisfied the minister.

Q. Yes, any person who has satisfied the minister?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. CAHAN: That clause was only inserted in 1926, according to the evidence.

Mr. LUCAS: No, I think that was part of the order in 1923, was it not?

WITNESS: No, sir. April 8th, 1926.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Well, according to the book here, it says that was part of the order of 1923, and it was amended in 1926?—A. That was the amendment of 1926. I will produce the copy of the Order in Council for you.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: 183 is the amendment of 534.

WITNESS: Yes, that is the way to put it. No, 642 was the amendment on the 31st day of January, 1923. I have not the dates here, but 534 is included. Let me see if I can trace it for you.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: 534 was the relationship, and 183 includes Clause 7.

WITNESS: Just a minute, I will see if I can trace it. Mr. Little, would you be good enough to tell me if No. 534 issued—

Mr. LITTLE: That was the amendment.

WITNESS: Yes, that is right; that was the amendment, April 8th, 1926.

Mr. LUCAS: I have the book here, and I would like to have this matter cleared up in my own mind.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. P.C. 183 is the 31st day of January, 1923?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it gives this list of instructions here, and clauses, in which is Clause 7?—A. Yes. As explained to Mr. Cahan, that No. 7 only came into P.C. 183 on April 8th, 1926.

Q. Well, then according to that, this P.C. 183 was not in effect then till April, 1926?—A. Oh, no. It has been in effect since the 31st January, 1923.

Q. But the amendment?—A. That came into effect April 8th, 1926.

Q. The point I am getting at is this, that Clause 7 was in effect, or was not in effect till the amendment took place?—A. Clause 7 was not there at all. That was added to P.C. 183 by 534.

Q. It does not so state here?—A. No, it does not. I noticed that when Mr. Cahan was speaking.

Q. I would like to ask the minister to explain what were the conditions prior to 1923 when order 183 was issued?—A. I will be glad to give you the explanation of that again, but you will find it in the Appendix No. 3 where I have given the returns showing the reason. The practice before that was

ministerial action actually, rather than Order in Council, on account of the desire not to mention in any Order in Council that one country was preferred to another. "The principle of preferred countries, or preference of nationals was embodied in the following Orders in Council:"

I am reading from observations dated March 22nd, 1928:

Occupational Regulation

P.C. 717, dated 9th of May, 1922,—occupational regulation.

P.C. 183, dated 31st of January, 1923,—rescinded P.C. 717, occupational regulations.

P.C. 642, dated 11th of April, 1923,—amended P.C. 183, occupational regulation.

Passport Regulation

P.C. 1041, dated 12th of May, 1922.

P.C. 185, dated 31st January, 1925, rescinded P.C. 1041.

Preferred countries under the above regulations were limited entirely to the British Isles, self-governing Dominions, Newfoundland, and the United States of America. It was considered that the extension of preferred countries, or a designation of preferred countries in Europe by Order in Council—which would mean discrimination of certain European countries—would create a hostile feeling towards Canada on the part of the Governments and nationals of non-preferred countries from which Canada desires only farmers, farm labourers and household workers.

At a conference with the transportation companies it was, therefore, decided to designate preferred countries, not by Order in Council but by ministerial action. Ministerial action of this kind has been taken at different times since the 4th of May, 1910, the date on which the present Immigration Act was passed, e.g., the money qualification was not enforced in the case of a British immigrant who was in good health and for whom work could be found. In the same way, the money qualification was not enforced in the case of immigrants who could not comply with the money qualification or the non-continuous journey regulation, who were of a desirable type, sound in mind and body, and coming to Canada to earn their livelihood on the land. Immigrants of other than the classes defined by the Orders in Council have been admitted from non-preferred countries provided they were coming to relatives or friends already established in Canada.

It was in that connection that whatever admissions were allowed previous to April 8th, 1926, people of that kind came from the continent.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Members of Parliament, or other persons of high standing—A. Please do not. I qualified that. I did not say "high-standing". I did not say anything of the kind. I said, members of Parliament or people of standing, and I distinctly stated that I did not mean by that people with any particular light on them, or that they had a bunch of money, or anything of that character.

Q. Mr. Egan, please understand I am not trying to infer anything?—A. I did not say "high-standing" and I would rather it did not go into the record.

Q. Members of Parliament and persons of standing, prior to 1926—A. April 8th, 1926, yes.

Q. Were they permitted to make application for those coming in?—A. Were they permitted?

Q. Yes, to sponsor them?—A. Did I sponsor them?

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. No, no. Were those people we have just been discussing a short while ago permitted to sponsor them, or did sponsor their application, that is, the number you gave?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did this condition obtain prior to April 8, 1926?—A. You mean, was it in practice?

Q. Yes?—A. Under ministerial action?

Q. Yes?—A. Yes.

Q. For how long a period?—A. Well, ever since I have been in the Department, and long before; probably about eighteen years, if I can connect the different sections of the Act together.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. There have been some rumours regarding bogus permits, that certain unscrupulous persons had obtained what purported to be a copy of the letter of entry and were having it printed and sold to those who were anxious to get relatives and friends into the country; do you know anything about that?—A. Yes, I do. While we get a good many kicks and abuse, you will be glad to know that not one of those passed in our offices; they were detected at once, and as soon as a case came to our notice we immediately took action with the Mounted Police, and they are working in certain directions. I would rather not go any farther with it, because they have not been able to lay their hands on anybody.

Q. Do you know how general that practice was; were there many cases of that kind or how many attempted to come in on those bogus permits?—A. I could perhaps tell you. I am speaking from memory only. Perhaps fifteen were in evidence at one or two of our offices on the Continent. The first was detected, and the word went back that they were no good, that they could not come in, and that was the end of it.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. How do you protect yourself or the department? Suppose somebody makes an application for, say, Mr. Spaghetti, to come into Canada; how do you know whether it is Mr. Spaghetti that comes in or Mr. Vermicelli?—A. What do you mean?

Q. You have to have a photograph taken?—A. Yes.

Q. How do you check that up, in that case?—A. If he is a British subject, he has to have a medical card. It is exactly the same situation in Mr. Spaghetti's case. The bearer of that document is double-checked, for either Mr. Spaghetti or Mr. Vermicelli. It is double-checked in so far as the Italian Consul here must vouch for it; he must give a receipt for it, and he forwards it to the Old Country, or sends it to the—perhaps I should not call them Cantons, in Italy, but to the district and the government advises the man that this particular document is there for him, and the passport with the photograph is visaed, and signed.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. Returning again to the bogus permits, can you tell us whether any prosecutions have taken place?—A. Yes, I have advice that one man has been arrested or detained. The police have taken action in one direction, and they hope to take action in the regular way.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Perhaps the Committee has a wrong idea about the instructions Mr. Cahan has referred to. He inadvertently referred to special privileges to members of Parliament. Take the applications sponsored by members of parliament,

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

were the instructions of Mr. Forke not restrictive of the practice that had previously existed?—A. Absolutely. I explained to Mr. Cahan that the whole purpose Mr. Forke had in view was to hold it down to a limitation. That was his object, that our other avenues were big enough without spreading the section through in any particular way. That was the whole object of Mr. Forke.

Q. It was not conferring any special privileges on members of parliament?—A. No, indeed; it was giving them lots of trouble.

Q. Previous to Mr. Forke's administration, members of parliament had been sponsoring applications?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. And this meant that they took full responsibility for it?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. I understand that the number of letters of admission you gave included the period from the month of October, 1926, to the present time?—A. From June to the present time.

Q. From June to the present time?—A. Yes.

Q. I understand there would be another period from April, 1923, which I understand was the date of P.C. 183; am I right in that?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know the number from April, 1923, to April, 1926?—A. No. I only know this number because it was a change, and we wanted to see how far it was going to go. We wanted to keep tab, in other words, as much as possible, on the increased number of continental immigrants coming in. Previous to that it was a general filing system which would mean pulling to pieces every file in the Department.

Q. I gather from what you said that as Mr. Forke's instruction was restrictive in its operation, the number of letters of admission for the period before that, to which I have just referred, would be greater per year or per month, we might say, than for the period from April, 1926, to the present time?—A. That I cannot say very definitely, because after all you know something of the continentals, do you not? You must have met some of them in your practice, sir.

Q. I have?—A. They are as steadfast as can be, when they have it in their minds that they want their particular relative to come to live with them, particularly if they can afford it, and they have gone into that as they did in the past, and the member of parliament is loaded with the task of trying to get it for them. Answering the question, I do not think it would be larger than before, because we were always holding them down.

Q. But the scope of responsibility was wider before April, 1926, than now?—A. Yes.

Q. It was restricted to members of parliament, senators and defeated candidates?—A. Yes.

Q. Before that it was wider in its application?—A. Yes; that is true.

Q. One would think that if there was any difference the number would probably have been greater?—A. The members of Parliament were not in as large numbers as now, due to the fact that it applies to them only.

Q. I think you have made it clear already, but I want to be sure of it; you made it plain that members of Parliament had no special privileges at any time except as indicated?—A. Except that when they wrote to me about a particular case I would write back and say, "If you are prepared to assume the responsibility," or if not give the information required.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. When was Germany put on the preferred list?—A. About a year and a half ago.

Q. Austria is not on the preferred list?—A. No.

Q. None of the Balkan States is on the preferred list?—A. No.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. When you made a list of the preferred and non-preferred countries you did not have in mind any of the countries that fought with the Allies or against them?—A. I did not make the list. It was made before I came in.

Q. You said about a year and a half ago?—A. No, you asked me about Germany. Germany was put on about a year and a half ago. You asked me when she was put on the list. That is why I put it in that way.

Q. What other countries were put on the list when Germany was put on?—A. None.

Q. That was the only one?—A. Yes.

Q. She had sat on the penitential bench for five years before she was permitted to come in?—A. That is your version of it.

Q. Do you say you were not considering Austria?—A. I would not say we were not considering it. While one feels that in Austria they are just of the same type as the Germans, if you find them from the country districts you will probably give them some consideration; yet the actual facts are that Austria is very, very limited as far as men physically fit or with farm labour experience is concerned. It is more a matter of city life with them.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. That is a matter of policy?—A. It is a matter of policy and I need not have explained that.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. Roumania is not on the list?—A. No.

Q. It would be very much easier for me, as a member of parliament, if they were on the preferred list?—A. And a much tougher proposition for Canada generally.

Q. I consider they are quite as good as Germans?—A. I am suggesting that because there is not that organization in those countries below the line that there is above.

Q. Organization of what kind?—A. Of the people generally. However, this is a part of policy, so that I will not go any farther with it than that.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: As the Minister has suggested it as a matter of policy, and as he has been on the stand already, perhaps he will answer the question as to whether the government intends to widen the door and admit Austria and Roumania.

Mr. JACOBS: I would not be so bold as to suggest to Mr. Forke any question of policy.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I am bold enough to ask him whether he has any suggestions of policy along that line to make.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we had better continue with the witness on the stand.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: This is not the proper place to make them.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I don't know that it is not.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I am not making any declarations of that kind.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: The witness objected to answering anything which might appear to be a matter of policy, and you asserted at once that you would announce matters of policy at the proper time. I thought perhaps you would take the Committee into your confidence and tell us whether you propose to open the door and make Austria and Roumania preferred countries, as well as Germany. If you do not wish to do it here, you can say it on the floor of the House.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Would this be a correct inference, that prior to April 8, 1926, this practice of issuing permits was generally increasing; that it was a growing practice?—A. I suppose it was growing right along; that is, continental immigration was growing in Canada, and that was one of the reasons why the Minister came to this conclusion. It was growing, so that we were having too much to do, but I do not think the numbers granted were very much different.

Q. But it was a growing practice?—A. The demand on us was very great.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Would it be right to say that this change that was made in April, 1926, was a case of "passing the buck" on to the members instead of the Department?—A. I suppose it works out in that way, but we had no intention to do that.

Q. I would like to ask you, would you care to give us your opinion as to whether this is the best way of deciding whether these people should get admission or not? Could there not be a better way found than to require members of parliament to sponsor them?—A. We do not require them to. If he volunteers, and he does not make too many applications, we accept of necessity. You know the merits of the case, whether he is a member of parliament or not, and whether it is a case deserving of immediate attention or not.

Q. I do not think that statement is quite correct, Mr. Egan, particularly in regard to those men who live in very large constituencies. It seems to me that your Department might find a better way of checking up the number of applicants, to see whether they really are entitled to get letters of admission. I am just trying to get your opinion?—A. As a matter of fact we do.

Q. Had you any way of checking up on these applications to see whether they were really entitled?—A. Well, as a matter of fact I had. When it comes to a large city constituency, as a matter of fact every member of a large city constituency knows that he is simply submitting something to me that I am going to have investigated. There may be the odd exception.

Q. I am looking ahead to the time when this Committee will have to approve a report and I think it is advisable that you should consider very carefully the question of making some change in regard to the issuing of letters of admission, and that is the reason why I am trying to get your opinion as to whether there could not be a better way of assuring yourself of the facts in connection with these cases than requiring these people to get their members of Parliament to endorse them?—A. Every time someone speaks to me of a better way, I can say that there are several better ways. One better way would be not to have Section 7 in there at all. I do not think it is feasible, because there are certain conditions which make it impracticable. Another better way would be, perhaps—as we have talked it over, the Minister and myself and the officials of the Department—to put some sort of stamp on the proposition; but every time you talk of bettering the way along lines anything like that, unless it is some restrictive measure, or confined to a certain district, you are immediately talking to me about increasing my estimates, because it costs a tremendous lot of money to investigate these cases.

Q. Do you not think that they should be investigated by someone?—A. I insist upon investigating them.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I submit that is a matter for the Committee, rather than for Mr. Egan, with all deference to Mr. Coote. Mr. Egan is telling us what takes place, and if that is not satisfactory to Parliament or the Government, then it is up to this Committee to recommend a remedy, rather than for the Deputy Minister.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Coote:

Q. I do not want to question that principle. I have been asking Mr. Egan in regard to this matter, because I think he has been more closely connected with the work of the Immigration Department than anyone else, and knows more about the difficulties and knows more about the character of the people who come in under this particular Section that we are talking about, probably, than anyone else, and I thought that so far as I am personally concerned I would like very much to have his opinion. I am only going to ask him this one question in regard to the matter and he does not need to answer it if he considers it is out of his jurisdiction. Would you consider that it might be a good policy for us to require these people to go before a County Court Judge and get a recommendation from him for this admission, and take it out of the hands of members of Parliament?—A. Well, I have been accused of introducing restrictive measures galore in this country in asking an assurance, and it seems to me that would be going to the extreme limit. However, that is for you gentlemen to decide and not for me.

Q. Could you tell us something in regard to these 3,061 people that came in, in that stated period, as to what their nationality is? Would that be any more difficult when you are making that report?—A. Oh, yes, it would take weeks to get the nationality. I have only kept track of the number.

Q. Could you yourself briefly now tell us just what nationality it refers to particularly, the people that come under that Section?—A. That privilege, yes, I would say for a while Italians, Hebrews, Greeks, and a very small number of Armenians.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. Were there any Poles?—A. The Poles come in under another agreement. There are some Poles. That is the Hebrew, you see; the Russian Hebrew, or at least the Polish Hebrew.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. When you say Italians, does that mean coming from the whole of Italy, including some of the northern portions that have lately come into Italy, or not?—A. No, I could not tell you. I would say that most of them were southern Italians. Most of them. But quite a number come in from the north, or were coming. They are not coming now.

Q. Some of the people from Northern Italy come in under what are called the non-preferred?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. Mr. Egan, was any investigation or search of any kind made to ascertain the number of letters of Admission between April, 1923 and April, 1926?—A. No, sir.

Q. There is nothing on file at all?—A. No, sir, not that I know of. I could make inquiries and see if anything of that kind has been done. I came in in October, 1923 and I was in the midst of that particular work on account of certain conditions at Ellis Island and other places of that kind, I kept fairly close observation but did not make any record.

Q. Since this inquiry has started searches have been made to get certain information and I thought possibly some effort had been made to get what I am after. You say, none.—A. None that I know of.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Would that be difficult to ascertain?—A. Yes, I would say that if you want that ascertained it would take three months with ten to twenty employees working constantly.

Q. Does that mean that the number is so large that it would take that long?—A. No, it means that we have hundreds of thousands of files and we would have to search every file to secure it.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. The letters of Admission go on the file of the particular immigrant, do they?—A. Yes.

Q. And that is the reason that you would have that difficulty, you would have to draw all these individual files?—A. Do you mean previous to that?

Q. Yes.—A. Oh, yes. We would have to draw every file. We do not indicate that it is a letter of Admission. It is a file under a man's name.

Q. The letter of Admission is only evidence of the fitness?—A. Nothing more or less, and if he conforms to that, it exonerates him from nothing in the Act, except that it is an evidence that assured employment is in Canada for him. In every other respect he must fulfil the requirements of the Act.

Q. Since that time that they came in under these permits, how many immigrants came into Canada?—A. Offhand, about 135,000 a year. An average of 135 to 150 thousand a year.

Q. During that time there would be 150 to 200 thousand immigrants?—A. Yes, sir, more than that in the two years. I am taking the calendar year, the twelve months.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. I understand that no list was kept; for instance, when an application comes from someone for a letter of Admission and it goes through, the letter of Admission is given to the applicant, or some person in his behalf and a copy is put on the file of that particular individual?—A. Yes.

Q. Is there any separate list of those letters of Admission kept from time to time as they are issued?—A. Yes, only since September, I think, 1927.

Q. Then, as you say, you cannot get this other information in any way without going through all the files?—A. I would have to pull all my files.

By Mr. McPhee:

Q. Mr. Egan, in connection with those people who come under these letters of admission, do they have to comply with all the requirements of the Immigration Act?—A. Yes, every one of them. The letter is merely this, that our agent who vises passports on the other side—that man without that letter would be asked "what is your assurance of employment?" And unless he has something to show he would not get by, but with this letter it simply enables him to come providing he can conform to the Act, and all of that is mentioned in the letter.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You say you make investigations into each case submitted by members of Parliament? Is the investigation that you make intended for the protection of the members of Parliament?—A. Oh, absolutely. That is understood.

Q. And not intended as a reflection on him?—A. None whatsoever. It is as a protection for himself.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Mr. Cahan asked Mr. Egan whether he had any complaint from the Department of members of Parliament making money out of permits. I think he said "No" to that. I would like to know if any complaints have ever come to this Department of any one at all making money out of these permits?—A. Yes. I can only remember one case definitely, but I am quite sure that there are two. In this case the applicant himself submitted to our Local Agent that a

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

solicitor—who was far removed from Parliament and had never been near it in any shape, form or manner—was asking for a certain sum of money for this particular letter which had been procured. So we immediately cancelled it. There were two cases but I have only one in mind clearly. So we immediately cancelled that first letter and sent a letter to the man who had been good enough to protest to us about what this man was doing. I have often thought afterwards that that was perhaps a little Irish impetuosity, because I may not be a judge of what a lawyer should charge for his services that he renders to that individual; but at the same time, the charge seemed to me so high for the service I considered was rendered, that I jumped to that conclusion and choked him off and gave the Italian the permit asked. It was an Italian, in this case.

Q. Would you have any objection to telling the Committee the amount that he stated?—A. I cannot remember that now, but I know that it was so high that I acted in the way I have stated.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. One other thing. I think I understand it, but I think there is a misapprehension to some extent right in this building as well as in the country. We are constantly referring to “permits”. As far as I can understand there is no such thing as permits.—A. There is such a thing, but that is reported to the House. Section 4. That provides for someone who is already in Canada, who has arrived on our shores and is allowed to remain. He may have been a ship’s deserter and has not legally entered into the country. That is a permit.

Q. But I mean for an entry in the first instance?—A. You mean, what form does this letter take?

Q. No, no. What I want to clear up if I can is what I think appears to be a misapprehension.

Mr. CAHAN: Were you here in the early part of my examination of Mr. Egan, Mr. Boys?

Mr. BOYS: I was not here during all of your examination.

Mr. CAHAN: I spent several minutes in dealing with the different sections as you are now doing.

Mr. BOYS: But am I not right in this that there is really no such thing as a permit?

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Form A of the Act, I think is the form. There is such a thing as a permit; it is Form A in the Act and has to do with Section 4.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Is there a copy of an admission to be filed before the Committee?—A. In the department? No. But I will be glad to read you one if you wish.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. Take these 3,061. None of those are permits at all?—A. No, sir, they are letters of admission. Just a matter of identity and an assurance to our officer overseas that the man carrying this letter, if he fulfils the contract of the law, in other words the Act and its requirements, has assurance of employment or proper settlement in Canada. That is all it is.

Q. Why not call them now what they ought to be called, letters of admission?—A. They are really, sir; they have been called permits all this morning, but they are really letters of assurance of employment.

Q. Have they ever been issued in numbers? For instance, does any one man ever get twenty, thirty or fifty?—A. Not from me.

Q. And in every case the name of the individual, with other information is contained in that letter of admission?—A. Oh, yes. These are all separate letters.

Q. I have heard this question and you may as well clear it up, that men have gone and asked for fifty or one hundred permits, is the way it is generally put. Call them, if you like, letters of admission. No such practice has obtained during your time of office?—A. No, sir, nor ever, do I believe; positively not; nor ever, do I believe.

Q. Nor have they been issued in blank, either permits or letters of admission?—A. That is impossible. My system is such that that is impossible.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee is adjourned.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I presume Mr. Egan will come again?

The CHAIRMAN: He is always with us.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Because there are other matters we want to question him about.

The CHAIRMAN: He is always here. We will meet again on Tuesday.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until Tuesday, May 22, at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, May 22, 1928.

W. J. EGAN recalled.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Was there an official at one time in the Department, since you were Deputy Minister, by the name of Joe Featherston?—A. Yes.

Q. Was he transferred to China?—A. I came into the Department on October 11th. He was promoted to the post of Commissioner of the Chinese Immigration on October 12th.

Q. Was there any report around at the time that he had been too liberal in issuing permits or obtaining the issuing of permits for Jews coming into this country?—A. I had heard rumours to that effect. I made it my business to know Mr. Featherston before he left. Taking charge, and with my good impression of him, I made up my mind to dig in just a little further, and I am as convinced as that I am standing here that Joe Featherston was on the square in every sense of the word and never at any time took any money for anything that he may have done in his capacity at that time as Acting Secretary or something of that nature.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Is he alive now?—A. Mr. Featherston is dead.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. I had a slight acquaintanceship with him and my impression of him was as you have indicated. I am not suggesting that Mr. Featherston himself made any money in the trafficking in permits, but my question was, was he considered to be too liberal in dealing with or forwarding permits or applications made for the admission of Jews into this country, and had that anything to do with his transfer as a Commissioner to China?—A. As to having anything to do with it, being too liberal, and so forth, I just heard, as you suggest, rumours that he had not necessarily granted them himself, but he had encouraged perhaps a certain number coming who might, under other circumstances, have not come. As to that being any reason for his promotion to the position, far from it; it was because of his very special ability that he was promoted to this particular post. That is not an understanding, but is an actual fact in answer to a direct question by myself.

Q. As a matter of fact, as far as your knowledge is concerned, was there about that time or before or since that time any especially vigorous efforts on the part of certain people to get a large number of Jews admitted into the country?—A. There is a constant hammering from one end of Canada to the other.

Q. Was it especially vigorous at that time?—A. Not so far as I was concerned.

Q. In so far as the Department was concerned?—A. In so far as the Department was concerned, I would say not. As I told you before on the stand I naturally went through my files for years and years back and the only special movement I saw—I am speaking from memory entirely—was some four or five years before. Outside of that it was the usual member, for instance, asking on behalf of Jacob Cohen, whom he knows in his town and has known for twenty years, if he cannot bring his sister or the son of his sister, or some one of that kind, into Canada. It was all usual.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. Is it not a fact, Mr. Egan, known to you that certain parties in this country were very active—very active—in promoting the immigration into Canada of Polish and Russian Jews and Jews of other countries, and were very insistent on having these people admitted?—A. Yes, the Jewry itself had formed its own association with its branches to take up the work outside of the individual appeals on behalf of other Hebrews.

Q. Do you know of any organization or firm in Canada with banking arrangements at Antwerp or elsewhere on the continent, who provided money for the Jews so they could show they had a certain amount of money when coming in, and that organization was such that this money was handled over and over again; that is to say, that the company organized for the purpose of getting Jews admitted into Canada would supply them with funds so that they could show they were not penniless or destitute or likely to be so, and that the money, after they had got it, was handed back to the firm or organization and used over again for the admission of others? Was there anything along that line known or suspected as having taken place in this connection?—A. Years ago. There is nothing to my knowledge within the last five or six years because the monetary qualifications were not required, but years ago when they were required, and the immigrant had to have a certain amount of money, the sub-agents of steamship companies, ticket agents and so forth, would loan money at a certain rate.

Q. May I ask further? Was there any assumption or ground for the suspicion or belief that where these organizations were actively engaged in this work and advancing the money, they would advance, say, \$100, or any other amount, so that the immigrant could show that he had money when he came into Canada and that the organization exacted from the immigrant several times the amount of money they had advanced to him in order to show that he was not likely to become a public charge, and in that way made a considerable sum of money? Have you any ground for suspicions along that line?—A. No, because my mind would be disabused of that at once. You are speaking of Hebrews coming in. With all due respect to the smart appearing one on this side (indicating) I know of nothing to discount the inherent qualities of the Hebrew to hang on to his own, and why he should pay two or three times the amount he borrowed is beyond me. The hard-up fellow perhaps did pay \$15 or \$20 for that \$100, but if he had \$100 himself he would have no necessity to borrow for that purpose, although, as a matter of fact, it was \$250 which was required.

Q. I suppose the Hebrews, like people of another nationality whom I could mention, might refrain from making money out of his own as long as he could make it out of somebody else, but when the other well ran dry he might go so far as to make it out of his own.—A. He did in that case make it out of his own, but I cannot understand him paying \$200 for a \$100 loan, because if he had the \$200 to borrow that \$100 with, he could have come along without borrowing.

Q. But it is possible that they might place him under an application and give him a certain length of time in which to pay back not merely the \$100 but \$200 or \$300 more?—A. They would have an awful time collecting it from him when he got here.

Q. I grant you that it would be a congenial occupation to try to collect it?—A. I think from what I know of the type of men about whom you are speaking that it would be C.O.D. for what he was getting, and they would take no chances on waiting.

Q. I have asked these questions because in the short time I occupied the position of Minister of Immigration I was assailed right and left by those who were anxious to get these people in and were none too particular as to whether the regulations were followed or not.—A. I think perhaps it has taken on a different atmosphere. I think it was the Jewish Immigration Aid Society

which probably overcame some part of what you suggested, acting on behalf of their own people, and there has been nothing of the kind in evidence in recent years.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. Since you have been Deputy Minister has the illegal securing of permits by any official in your Department been called into question?—A. There is no such thing as the illegal procuring of permits.

Q. They cannot be illegally procured from the Department?—A. It is impossible, as far as the Department is concerned, anything in the shape of a letter of assurance of employment must come through me.

Q. Has your attention ever been directed to any alleged forgeries of permits?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell the Committee to what extent, whether it was serious, and what steps you took?—A. I gave evidence on that last week. There came before us evidence that certain people had forged our documents, that is, forged the signature, and had had printed and engraved letters similar to ours, and typed similar to ours. Every one in evidence was blocked by our officials on the other side; not one of them got through. When the first one came to my attention I immediately handed it over to the Mounted Police and one man is under detention now, and we are hoping to get others in connection with it.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. Have you any knowledge of a case which came up in the Supreme Court of Ontario at the city of Ottawa in October, 1925, with regard to five permits which were alleged to have been found on one of the witnesses together with receipts covering a large amount of money?—A. No, I have no knowledge at all. As a matter of fact that case is not of alleged permits. This man was securing illegal naturalization papers.

Q. I have here in my hand the Ottawa Citizen of February 13th, 1928, and there is a letter on the editorial page, part of which is as follows.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that a letter or an editorial?

MR. FANSHER (Last Mountain): It is a letter on the editorial page. It deals with a court case. I would like to ask Mr. Egan some questions about it, and I do not think I can state it any better than it is given here. It reads:

In the Spring Assizes of the Supreme Court of Ontario, held in March, 1925, in Ottawa, the pockets of one of the witnesses were searched by the order of the court and in his pockets were found five immigrant permits issued to an agent of Hamilton, Ontario, on representations made by a member of the House from Hamilton. Money receipts were also found in the pockets of this foreigner amounting to \$2,350 paid by this man to the agent mentioned for these five permits.

These permits were kept by the court and also the receipts and can be seen in the Osgoode Hall at any time. (See file Rex vs. Alexander No. 10, page 82.)

The WITNESS: That is another case entirely to the one Mr. Garland (Bow River) was referring. (To Mr. Garland, Bow River) That is a Toronto case. In that case, may I say now that it was not passports; it was naturalization papers which they had secured illegally. (To Mr. Fansher, Last Mountain) I have never read the report, but I understand from people who have spoken to me about it that the evidence was given and the Judge saw fit not to find that these parties had taken money in an illegal way. I am not speaking with absolute positiveness, but I think that was the particular verdict at that particular time. As to this gentleman getting the permits from us: not to my knowledge, because I had him on my blacklist the third day I was in the Department, and anybody who is on my blacklist will tell you how easy it is to get permits.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Why did you put him on the blacklist?—A. Because he was a shipping agent and used to go out and canvass certain interests. He went to the United States and came back and told us a lot of lies about the people having relatives in Canada, and having lied to us once, I would not believe him any further. If a man has a letter of assurance from us it has been issued in a legal way on the responsibility of somebody, but that is the weakness of the whole proposition. I do not care who the somebody of responsibility is, if it be a Member of Parliament or anybody else, if you would hand these to the relatives direct it would be all right, but if you hand them to anybody else then trouble begins.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. This case was heard in the City. Would there be anybody in a position to verify this statement or deny it, or give us any light on this particular matter?—A. I do not just follow you—

Q. Whether these permits were secured in the regular way, and nothing irregular in them at all?—A. Let me tell you this. You can take \$1,000,000, if you have it, and bet it against one cent that no man secured from us at any time since October 11, anything illegally nor did he pay one cent of money to the Department or a Departmental official in so far as they surround me and are directly responsible to me. I will take my oath upon that.

Q. I quite understand that. We understand there have been passports forged— —A. In the Old Country, yes.

Q. And we understand from evidence previously given that some people have tried to forge documents which never went through the Immigration Department at all; that is, these documents which were found in the pockets of the man mentioned in the letter in the newspaper, documents which have never been in the Immigration Department. That is the point I want to bring out.—A. That I do not know.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. They were not given to Alexander direct?—A. That is another case, sir; this is the Hamilton case.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. This case to which Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain) has referred: was that ever brought to your attention before?—A. As I stated a few moments ago, somebody spoke to me about having read something similar to this, but I never took any further notice of it.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Have you a solicitor in your Department?—A. No, sir. We always go to the Department of Justice when we need legal help. (Reads):

REVEREND CANON BURD'S EVIDENCE

On pages Nos. 269 and 270 of the Eleventh Meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, there is a reference by Reverend Canon Burd to a statement—so it is called—by His Lordship Bishop Lloyd, Saskatchewan. This statement was left with the Committee as evidence and it reads as follows:—

Having pointed out to Mr. Stewart, who then had charge of Immigration, the unfair discrimination on the part of his department in favour of Roman Catholic immigration projects, Mr. Stewart was very nice about it and said they did not want to be unfair and were quite willing to do for the Church of England as much as for

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

the Romanists. I then outlined what I wanted, viz., the cost of one Church of England representative divided between two men and Mr. Stewart agreed.

In February of 1925 I put the whole project before the Executive Committee of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and they passed a resolution, that we approve of the immigration proposals outlined by the Bishop.

These proposals were for two men, one to stay in England and collect the settlers, and one to travel backward and forward and find and place the people in this diocese. The Synod to pay the stipend of \$100 a month each and the department to find the expenses not to exceed a like amount.

About the end of March, I left for the Old Country calling in on Mr. Stewart to tell him that the Synod had agreed to the arrangement. We discussed the matter again and I gave the Minister the name of the first man, Mr. Harding, then in England. I then went on to St. John to sail for England to put the arrangement into effect.

A certain official, when he heard what I was going to do suggested that it would be better to get the agreement with the department in writing.

On that I wired Mr. Stewart to confirm the agreement for two men and received a reply just as my vessel sailed, that the department found they had overdrawn their appropriation.

The Synod paid the three months' stipend to Mr. Harding for holding back from another appointment on my cable from Ottawa telling him we wanted him for immigration work.

I have suspected since that the wire came from Mr. Egan and not from Mr. Stewart. Therefore, I was greatly rejoiced when Mr. Forke took charge of the Department of Immigration.

I think the Department of Immigration, at least from its British side, would be far more efficient if Mr. Egan were moved to some other department.

(Signed) GEORGE EXTON LLOYD,
Bishop of Saskatchewan.

Within one minute of my return to the office after this particular session of the Committee I instructed one of the officials under me to search for any file connected with Bishop Lloyd and endeavour to locate either the memorandum of instructions to the Assistant Deputy Minister or myself regarding an arrangement with Bishop Lloyd and the Minister, or Acting Minister, and if in evidence to bring the file to me for observation. I also told the official in question to look for a copy of any telegram or any dictation in connection with the same to Bishop Lloyd, addressed to His Lordship at St. John, N.B. Within fifteen minutes the official brought me the file and stated, "Mr. Egan, there is nothing on file of such a nature," and, as he had the file in his hand, I went over it personally. My search of the file simply confirmed what the official stated to me.

This is the record of the departmental files in regard to Bishop Lloyd's suspicion. As for myself, I want to state most positively and emphatically that I knew, or know, nothing of such an arrangement and knew or know nothing whatsoever of the telegram referred to.

Now in reference to the last paragraph of Bishop Lloyd's letter or memorandum,—

I think the Department of Immigration, at least from its British side, would be far more efficient if Mr. Egan were moved to some other department.

you would not expect me to make any apology for being a member of the Catholic Church, or a loyal subject of His Majesty, the King, and my appreciation of my oath of office, but I do think the information to which the Committee are entitled should be submitted. I am going to submit cold facts and not argument.

From the day I went into the Department I have never decided on any recommendation to my Minister as regards what may be termed actual schemes of immigration or their operation—that is methods to be adopted in their working out—without a round table conference with my chief officials, none of whom can be accused of being anti-British or anti-Protestant. The purpose of our conference is to thrash out the pros and cons of any schemes submitted, either by myself or by any of my officials. Finally our conclusions are nearly always unanimous and our findings are always based on the Act we have to administer, keeping Canada and the welfare of the immigrant in the foreground. If, perchance, we cannot come to an unanimous conclusion, then, the views of two sides, or perhaps three, are submitted to the Minister who may hear them separately or collectively. In addition may I say that the Minister has established a practice of holding a conference of Departmental officials in his office every Monday morning at ten o'clock to discuss what he may have to offer or any question that any of the officials may submit to him.

So that the Committee may further appreciate the value of the Bishop's conclusion, I will read extracts from a memorandum submitted to my Minister on May 8th, 1924, seven months after I took charge of the Department.

Listen to this, and compare it with the suggestion that I am anti-British.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. As a matter of fact, Mr. Egan, his lordship did not accuse you of being anti-British. That is your inference from his words?—A. What else could he mean when he says, "I think the Department of Immigration, at least from its British side, would be far more efficient if Mr. Egan were moved to some other Department"? I ask you in all fairness if my conclusion is an unfair one.

Let me refer to my memorandum to the Minister, the Honourable Mr. Robb, of May 8th, 1924—

Within the first two weeks of my taking charge of the Department, every moment I had to spare was devoted to consideration of the real object of immigration and colonization, which must mean the placing of permanent settlers on the land.

Our first thought is, of course, for people from the Old Country, that is, Great Britain or Ireland, coming to Canada in any number.

We have, as you know, already made considerable progress through the medium of the Empire Settlement Scheme and its much freer action this year, in conjunction with our Land Settlement Branch, which means using the offices of the Soldier Settlement Board throughout Canada.

As to the placing of permanent settlers on the land, our first thought is, of course, for people from the Old Country, that is, either the United Kingdom or Ireland, and our experience with our more than liberal Empire Settlement Scheme policy proves that it is difficult to secure such settlers in any number. Within the last two weeks, after our successful placing of the Hebrideans, I had several chats with Major Barnett, which resulted in our sending a cable to our director in Lon-

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

don, offering to place on the land from Nova Scotia to British Columbia one hundred and sixty-five families with fifty pounds in their possession. So far the answer is that there are seven only of these families in sight, but, coupled with this cabled information is a query asking if we could place forty families—mostly from Northern Scotland, but without funds. This is a proof that means must be provided by which they can be settled; that is, provided with a few horses, cows, poultry and implements.

Australia has realized that, while the Empire Settlement Scheme of assisted passages did stimulate immigration, it did not stimulate land settlement, and they have organized a scheme of money loaning to the settler in which they share with the Empire Settlement authorities.

As you know, I have all along claimed that Canada, on account of its geographical position, is a positive asset to the Old Country, and then of course there are many reasons why it is a real, prospective new homeland to so many from the United Kingdom, and I am convinced that it would not be a difficult task to persuade the Overseas Settlement Board to enter into agreements with Canada on an entirely different basis to that followed in the case of Australia and with the Canadian National Railways this year; some agreement which would meet our special requirements in this country and at the same time not involve the Imperial Government in any greater loss than it is taking in its arrangement with Australia.

Canada has a great advantage over the other Dominions in that it has a large amount of Crown Lands that can be used in negotiating agreements with the Imperial Government. In New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and Northern British Columbia these lands are adjacent to main lines of the Canadian National Railways, and are in sections where seasonable employment at lumbering and mining is available. In the prairie provinces the free lands are owned by the Federal Government and are also close to the railway in most cases.

If we urge upon the Imperial Government that Canada will contribute land for settlement provided the Imperial Government will contribute three hundred pounds per settler, which it has already expressed its willingness to do, we should undertake entirely the administrative cost, including supervisory and advisory assistance to settlers after location, and as a guarantee of our good faith, we should undertake to carry and to repay to the Imperial Government one-half the loss that may be involved by that Government arising from settlement. The very improvements made would always be our guarantee re no loss.

Since I knew of your decision to sail to the Old Country in July next, and taking into consideration the stand taken by Mr. Thomas, the Colonial Secretary of the new Government in England, I have become convinced that the near future is the opportune time for us to put over in a settlement arrangement something that no other Dominion or interest has been able to accomplish, and I would ask you to please give this matter your consideration, and make an endeavour while in the Old Country, so that all the details required may be in evidence.

I would recommend that arrangements be made for Major Barnett to proceed to the Old Country just when it would suit you best on your trip, as he is—as you know—so familiar with all the details regarding land, etc. He and I have discussed from time to time just what would be essential for real land settlement in Canada, and I believe that, even if we do not succeed in an endeavour of this kind, it is worth the attempt, and I would respectfully ask for your opinion in reference to all that I have submitted.

That, gentlemen, is part of my evidence; I should like to go farther. We, of the Department, are receiving continually letters criticising the religious complexion of administration officials. As I told you before, I make no apology for being a member of the Catholic Church, and I think it is fair to the Committee and to the people of Canada at large that I should read the following memorandum:

Religious Complexion of the Whole Personnel of the Department.

I think it will be agreed that the shortest way to dispose of any statements or insinuations which have been made or appeared in many parts of Canada (and of which a number of the Committee are aware) regarding religious discrimination in connection with the administration of the Department, is to present the following facts:—

A compilation made last September showed that the total number of regular officers was 941 of which 629 were non-Roman Catholic and 312 were Roman Catholic. The following is a summary of the non-Roman Catholic and Roman Catholic officials.

Roman Catholics at Head Office

Deputy Minister,
Accountant,
Minister's Private Secretary.

Non-Roman Catholics at Head Office

Minister of Immigration,
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Commissioner of Colonization,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Division Commissioner of Immigration,
Assistant Division Commissioner of Immigration,
Travelling Immigration Inspector,
Assistant Travelling Immigration Inspector,
Director of Publicity,
Assistant Director of Publicity,
Supervisor, Women's Branch,
Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration,
Statistician,
Supervisor of Personnel,
Head of the Registration Branch.

In Canada, outside of Ottawa, we have two district Commissionerships, one at Winnipeg and one at Vancouver. One of these is filled by a Roman Catholic and the other by a non-Roman Catholic. We have Immigration Agents at Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto and Victoria. Three of these agents are Roman Catholics, the other three non-Roman Catholic.

In the United States we have sixteen agents and four assistant agents. Only three of these are Roman Catholic.

In the British Isles we have ten agents, a number of assistant agents and also eight women officers. All the agents but one, all the assistant agents and all the women officers but one, are non-Roman Catholic. The Director in London who is in charge of the work in the British Isles and on the Continent, is a non-Roman Catholic. The Assistant Director is a Roman Catholic. All the other principal officers under the Director in London are non-Roman Catholic.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

On the Continent of Europe we have eight Inspectors. Either three or four of these are non-Roman Catholic, the balance being Roman Catholic.

I want to make it clear that the whole of my statement is not a defence of any kind because no man should be discounted or maligned in any position of life because he happens to be of any particular religious persuasion.

I felt that the Committee should have this as evidence from me. I should like, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, to give the Committee a few facts in connection with Federal and Provincial co-operation. This will include a clear statement of the various schemes that are working and in prospect. (Reading):

Realizing the importance of close co-operation between Dominion and Provincial Governments, the Federal Department has on various occasions invited the provinces to meet the Department for discussion of immigration problems and policies.

Federal-Provincial co-operation has had a varied history, covering a considerable period, both in Canada and abroad. In Canada this co-operation has been associated principally with placement of farm labour and houseworkers. The Province of Ontario, for example, has annually brought in many farm workers, both single and married, and many houseworkers. Co-operation between the Dominion and the Province in this work begins overseas with recruitment and inspection. The inspection of houseworkers before sailing is almost entirely undertaken by women officers of the Federal Government. Co-operation is continued through the assisted passage scheme, and, on arrival in Canada, by women officers of the Federal Government, who meet the newcomers and look after them until they arrive at destination, when the houseworkers as well as farm workers are placed under the auspices of the Provincial Government. This work is supplementary to the general recruiting and placing of farm labour and houseworkers in Ontario undertaken by the Federal Government. In the Eastern Townships of Quebec the placement of farm labour is undertaken largely by an organization which receives Provincial support as well as Federal recognition and assistance. Examples might be given of similar co-operation between the Federal Department and other provinces. An important angle of this co-operation has been developed along the line of schemes for establishing British boys in Canada.

There are joint Agreements between the British Government, the Dominion Government and several Provincial Governments for the reception, distribution, placements and short training, if necessary, of British boys. Agreements have already been completed with the Provincial Government of Ontario and the Provincial Government of Manitoba. Negotiations are also completed for similar Agreements with the Provincial Governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

The main provisions of these Agreements may be summarized as follows:—

1. The provincial Government supplies the farm.
 2. The cost of operation is shared on the following basis:—
- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| Provincial Government. | 25% |
| Dominion Government. | 25% |
| | — 50% |
| British Government. | 50% |

The contribution on account of operation is on the basis of the number of boys brought forward, i.e., the Provincial Government contributes \$10, the Dominion Government \$10, and the British Govern-

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

ment \$20 per boy. This means that 250 boys there is available a contribution of \$10,000 or for 500 boys the contribution of \$20,000 for operation. These Provincial Headquarter centres are situated as follows:—

Nova Scotia.—Negotiations pending.

New Brunswick.—The Cossar Farm at Lower Gagetown has been designated by the Province as the Provincial centre in the Province of New Brunswick.

Quebec.—The British Immigration and Colonization Association who place boys in the Eastern Townships and in Eastern Ontario have a farm on the Island of Montreal.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. That is for boys from fourteen years up?—A. Fourteen to seventeen. I might explain about Quebec, the British immigration and colonization, the Government and ourselves, that we have assistance there.

Q. Do you give any assistance in maintaining that organization in Montreal?—A. No, only towards the clearing house and the handling of the boy on the farm. (Reading):

Ontario.—The Ontario Government have a Provincial Farm known as Vimy Ridge which, I understand, extends to about 400 acres in Western Ontario.

Manitoba.—For the time being, the Manitoba Agricultural College is the reception and distributing centre for the Province of Manitoba.

Children

For children other than those migrating under the auspices of Voluntary Societies and including those destined to Provincial centres, the assistance takes the form of a free agent of the total cost of transportation provided that—

- (i) they have not reached their seventeenth birthday before the first day of April of the financial year in which they sail.
- (ii) They are proceeding as members of families with parents or other approved guardians or are proceeding to join their parents or other approved guardians or relations.
- (iii) They are proceeding with the consent of their parents or guardians to a home approved by the Dominion Government, or
- (iv) they are proceeding under a scheme approved by the Secretary of State and the Dominion Government. The expenses of the transportation of children shall be shared equally by the Secretary of State and the Dominion Government.

The two Provincial centres now in operation brought out last calendar year the following number of boys:—

British Immigration and Colonization Association..	798
Provincial Government of Ontario—Vimy Ridge: ..	409

1,207

New Brunswick.—Cossar Farm was formerly operated under the same conditions as a Juvenile Society, but arrangements have been made to designate the Cossar Farm as a Provincial centre. We do not know how many boys will be brought out, but there will be a number.

Manitoba.—The Provincial Government has decided to utilize the Manitoba Agricultural College as a Provincial training centre and has placed an order for 100 boys who are now being recruited in the British Isles.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Boys who come out under Provincial auspices are placed in employment with farmers who are selected by the Provincial Government at the standard wage of the district with free board and lodging. The Provincial Government is responsible for the boys' welfare for three years after their arrival and giving after care so that the boys can gain the experience needed to enable them to become farmers on their own account.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Do I understand the provincial government assumes the responsibility for them?—A. Of placing. We always check back, from the juvenile point of view, but they do the placing.

Q. Do you have officials who regularly visit them?—A. Yes.

Q. Are they officers of the Federal Government?—A. They are officers of the Federal Government.

Q. The responsibility ends when the boy is placed?—A. Well, the boy always has a home to go to, on the training farm.

Q. Apart from that, if he is satisfactorily placed, they do not visit?—A. No, we report to them or they report to us if there is anything unsatisfactory, otherwise we just carry on.

SPECIAL SCHEMES FOR TRAINING BRITISH BOYS

Alberta. Agricultural Training Schools.—For boys and young men aged 17 to 25 years who have the sum of £50 at their disposal. Free training in all branches of farming is given during the winter months at one of the agricultural schools established by the Alberta Government, the student paying about £6 per month for board and lodging. The students are then placed in employment for the summer season with farmers selected by the Provincial Government of Alberta and the Department of Immigration at the standard wage of the district plus board and lodging, in order that practical experience of farm work may be gained. At the end of the summer the students are encouraged to return to the agricultural school for a second winter's free training; the student, as before, paying about £6 per month for his maintenance. When a thorough knowledge of Canadian farming methods has been gained, those who wish to start farming on their own account will be advised and assisted by the Alberta Government's agricultural experts. Students travel to Alberta at a reduced rate of about £5 10s.

Ontario. Guelph Agricultural College.—(Affiliated to Toronto University.)—Fifty places at this College are available each year for British youths aged 17 years and upwards at a fee of approximately 50 guineas per annum. The course of tuition is for either two or four years, and is designed to give youths of good education a thorough grounding in the theory and practice of Canadian farming. Students attend college from September till April, and for this period the fees cover the expenses of instruction, maintenance, books, etc. During the spring and summer, employment is found for the students with farmers in Ontario, from whom they receive wages and board and lodging while gaining experience of practical farm work.

Montreal. Macdonald Agricultural College. (Incorporated with McGill University.)—Boys from public or secondary schools, of 17 years of age and upwards, are given a two years' course of training in agriculture at Macdonald College. Tuition is free of cost, and the total expenses for board and lodging, laboratory fees, subscriptions, games,

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

etc., are approximately £40 per annum. From 1st April to 31st October the students do practical work on farms selected by the college authorities, receiving a minimum wage of 10s. per week with board and lodging. A superintendent appointed by the college is in touch with the boys during this period. From 1st November to 31st March theoretical and practical training is given in the college, to which a farm of 500 acres is attached. During the second year facilities for specializing are provided.

BOYS LAND SETTLEMENT SCHEME

The Provincial reception and distributing centre is regarded as the first step to the ultimate settlement of British boys.

Under date of the 1st of July, 1927, the Department concluded an Agreement with the British Government for the settlement of British boys.

The following is a summary of the main provisions of the Agreement:—

A. The Agreement is applicable solely to boys from the United Kingdom,

- (a) who (i) have proceeded to Canada since the date of the Empire Settlement Act, i.e. 31 May, 1922, provided that preference shall be given to settlers who have been trained at the Provincial Headquarters Farms,
- (ii) have attained their 14th but not their 17th birthday at the time of their arrival in Canada,
- (iii) have not come to Canada with their parents or to join their parents in Canada;
- (b) who have reached their 21st but not their 25th birthday at the date of application for assistance under this Agreement;
- (c) who are in possession of savings amounting to approximately \$500;
- (d) who have acquired the necessary experience of farm work in Canada by working as agricultural labourers for wages or in such other manner as the Dominion Government may consider sufficient provided that the Dominion Government shall be satisfied that the applicants are industrious, economical and capable of managing a farm;
- (e) in respect of whom a Provincial Government makes a cash contribution of not exceeding \$250 per settler.

The Dominion Government has undertaken all the administrative functions under the Scheme and to give all necessary expert advice and assistance to settlers. Applicants who qualify under the Scheme will receive a total advance of \$2,500 as follows:—

British Government..	\$ 1,250
Dominion Government..	1,000
Provincial Government..	250
	<hr/>
	\$ 2,500
Applicant's savings..	500
	<hr/>
	\$ 3,000

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Is the \$250 a provincial loan?—A. Yes. It is a loan. I might explain right here that we are moving forward with the idea of having more provinces, perhaps, come in a little more rapidly towards making our loan \$1,250, and not

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

anything from the provinces, but the provinces to do the administering, that is, the collections and so forth, and I think that is going to meet with very good results.

The total cash advances to be made under this Agreement are as follows:—

(i) During the year 1928-29..	\$ 300,000
(ii) During the year 1929-30..	400,000
(iii) Each of the years 1930-31 to 1936-37..	700,000
or a total advance of..	\$ 4,300,000
plus boys' savings..	860,000
Total..	\$ 5,160,000

Under this Agreement cash advances will be made to settlers during the period from the 1st of April, 1928, until the 31st of March, 1937, for the purchase of farms or land holdings or for improvements thereto and of stock and equipment.

All advances to settlers are repayable with interest amortized at the rate of 5 per cent per annum in twenty equal annual payments.

The Provincial Governments of Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have agreed to participate in the Boys' Land Settlement Scheme.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Mr. Egan, that total of so many millions, it is on the basis as outlined before; it is not all Canadian?—A. No, half and half.

Q. Provincial and British?—A. Yes, I think it will make it, as far as cash advances are concerned, entirely Federal and British, the provinces taking the administration and collection, etc.

Here is another scheme, of which I will give you the evidence. It is the New Brunswick Land Settlement Scheme:

There is a tri-party Agreement between the British Government, the Dominion Government and the Provincial Government for the settlement of 500 families in the Province of New Brunswick between the first of March, 1928 and the 31st of March, 1934.

The main provision of the New Brunswick Land Settlement Agreement may be summarized as follows:

A. The Department of Immigration agrees—

- (a) to recruit and select the families:
- (b) to arrange for the transportation under whatever Passage Agreement may be in force:
- (c) to make adequate arrangements, in co-operation with the Provincial Government, for the reception and settlement of families on arrival:
- (d) to supervise settlement and give expert advice on the management of the farms.

The Provincial Government agrees—

- (a) to provide 500 improved farms suitable for the occupation of British families:
- (b) to assist in finding suitable employment for adult members of the families:
- (c) to sell the improved farms to the settlers at cost price, under an Agreement of Sale, repayment being arranged on a 25-year amortization basis with interest at 5 per cent annum.
- (d) to assist the Department of Immigration in all settlement work.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

The total advances of all descriptions under the Agreement is not to exceed \$5,100 in the case of any one settler, but will not likely approach this figure.

The British Government advances \$1,500 for stock and equipment, seed, feed and other similar purchases for the settlers or for providing him with initial operating expenses and, where necessary, subsistence, and to meet the initial payments due from the settlers on account of improved farms purchased by the Provincial Government provided that the initial payment shall not for any one settler exceed ten per centum of the value of his improved farms or a sum of three hundred dollars.

The British and Dominion Governments share all loss on account of stock and equipment.

Any loss incurred on account of the interest on the price of a farm during the first two years as the result of the failure of a settler shall be shared as follows:

The Dominion Government..	25%
The Provincial Government..	25%
The British Government..	50%

This is not complete, but it will be in evidence next year, I think. Perhaps I had better not mention that until it is an actual fact.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that all?

WITNESS: That is all of this particular memorandum. I have other memoranda, if you wish to hear it now.

The CHAIRMAN: It is nearly one o'clock now. We will hear Mr. Fansher's motion.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): This is my motion; that the proper officer of the Court be subpoenaed to attend and produce the Court record and all exhibits in the case of *Rex v Alexander*.

Motion agreed to.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. I would like to get this information in the report of the sitting of this committee to-day, Mr. Egan. I do not think it will take very long to answer the question. At the beginning of your statement to-day you gave the religious denominations of those at the head of the Department. While I was out West there was a rumour quite prevalent there that I think should be answered to-day, if possible, while we are on this question. The rumour was this; would you, Mr. Egan, if you can, tell the committee just how much truth there is in this rumour which is current in the West, that a number of Roman Catholic priests are to-day receiving transportation over the Canadian National Railways System; do you know anything about that?—A. Yes. We have had a good many inquiries along that line ourselves, Mr. Vallance. I made enquiries of the Canadian National Railways, and I find that there are forty clergymen travelling on passes for colonization work; twenty-seven of them are non-Catholic and thirteen are Roman Catholics. I think the name of the man who is spreading that stuff around is Maloney.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Along that line, I think it would be well to have these rumours cleared up. I received a letter from a gentleman out West in which he stated that there was a rumour that the doctors who are now employed in Great Britain were mostly Catholics. This morning you gave an account of the officials of the Department, and if you would just clear up this matter, that would settle it?—A. You will have to refer that to the Department of Health; I know nothing of it whatsoever.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. This privilege which you speak of as being possessed by forty clergymen, was it not extended to those specially engaged in repatriation work also?—
 A. No. These are forty the C.N.R. are supposed to have. We have had many letters from some institution and some from individuals, who have said they heard it. I am very glad Mr. Vallance has mentioned it. In reference to repatriation work, in the past both railways have included them.

Q. They are not in the territories they are moving in?—A. No.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. You brought up the question of Canon Burd's evidence, in which he read a letter from Bishop Lloyd?—A. Yes.

Q. Bishop Lloyd did not accuse you of sending that telegram, but it was his suspicion. I understand you deny having sent that telegram?—A. Absolutely.

Q. Which I accept?—A. Not only do I deny it—

Q. That does not mean that there was no telegram sent to Bishop Lloyd?—
 A. No. I was only clearing up the suspicion, so far as I am concerned, of having sent it. I even asked my officials to look for a possible dictation of that kind on the file.

Mr. LUCAS: In Bishop Lloyd's letter I think he stated that he had had a suspicion that the former Minister, the Honourable Mr. Stewart, had sent it; perhaps Mr. Stewart can give us some information as to whether he sent that telegram or not?

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. When was the authority of the repatriation agents dispensed with?—
 A. At the end of 1927.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: I could not give the information at the moment. I had a good many conversations with Bishop Lloyd. A telegram may have been sent by somebody. I will have it looked up.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Is it not a fact, Mr. Egan, that the doctors were appointed by the Civil Service Commission?—A. That is my understanding of the evidence given by Dr. Amyot and Dr. Clark.

(Discussion followed).

The Committee adjourned until 11 a.m., Wednesday, May 23, 1928.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, May 29, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: At our last meeting it was decided to call Mr. Kolchin, of Winnipeg. I have here a report from Mr. Fraser, Clerk of the Committee, in regard to this matter. This reads:—

The Committee by motion of date May 23rd ordered that S. Kolchin, of Winnipeg, be summoned to appear before the Committee.

Pursuant thereto I wired Kolchin on May 25th a formal summons to attend before the Committee on Tuesday, the 29th instant.

Kolchin replied by wire of the same date that he would come if provided with the necessary funds.

I arranged transportation for him and advised him to that effect on the 26th inst. and that he must obey the summons.

Kolchin replied: "Transportation received. Have slight cold; intend to leave in the morning if not worse."

Later on the same day, consequent, as I understood, upon the receipt by you of a telegram from E. J. McMurray, I acted on your instructions and wired Kolchin postponing the date for his appearance before the Committee.

I have also received the following telegram from Mr. McMurray:—

Upon returning to Winnipeg have checked over ledgers and find that S. Kolchin paid to senior member of Wilton, McMurray, Lamont and Company on April fifteenth twenty-two, seventy-five dollars for legal work in connection with application made for admission four relatives Vekna, Ionkel, Beluta and Iosif Koltchynsky. The mother granted permission, others refused; she being old could not come alone. Account was not closed in Wilton, McMurray's books but transferred to new firm in which I have no interest. My staff preparing information to be given Committee, did not discover this owing to this transfer. These matters were entered under respective names throughout various ledgers of these firms. Do not know Kolchin personally, never met him, never saw him to my knowledge, never had any dealings with him. The evidence given coupled with this explanation shows fully all my transactions in these matters. My books open to investigation any person Committee desires to name. Writing.

Upon receipt of that telegram, a few members of the Committee were consulted, and it seemed to be the impression that it would be as well to postpone Mr. Kolchin's appearance until the Committee decided again whether they needed him or not. I took that action, and now it is for the Committee to say whether they think it is still desirable to summon Mr. Kolchin. I have a letter from Mr. McMurray very much along the same line as the telegram.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I think we should have the letter as well.

The CHAIRMAN: It reads as follows:—

McMURRAY, McMURRAY & GRESCHUK

WINNIPEG, CANADA, May 25, 1928.

W. F. KAY, B.C.L., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Canada.

DEAR SIR,—I wired you to-day, upon my return to Winnipeg, where I investigated the information asked for by Mr. Cahan.

You will remember that I informed the Committee that I was a member of the firm of Wilton, McMurray, Lamont, McMurray, Ritchie & Portigal during the year 1922; that I was not a member of the subsequent firms, and after coming back in the fall of 1925 I started in for myself, and in the fall of 1926 I formed a new firm which has continued during 1927 and this year.

The names which I gave to the Committee were names connected with the firms in which I was interested. My investigation shows that Kolchin, or Koltchynsky, on the 15th of April, 1922, paid into the firm of Wilton, McMurray & Company, \$75 in connection with the application he was making for admission of four relatives that he wanted brought to this country. The money was paid, so I am advised, purely as a legal fee. The mother was allowed to come but the other three were rejected, and the mother being old decided not to come as she could not travel alone.

I do not know Mr. Kolchin personally and never had any business dealings with him, and never saw the man in my life to my knowledge, and knew absolutely nothing of the transaction.

The account was not closed in 1922, but the books show it was transferred to the new firm, in which I had no interest at the time of the adjustment, and hence I did not have this information.

I regret very much that I did not postpone my examination at Ottawa and wire and get the particulars so that I could have given the whole matter in person to the Committee, but I trust that this explanation will clear this matter. I might add that my books are open to the inspection of any person whom the Committee might desire to name here.

I again repeat my statement, that I never trafficked in any shape or form in connection with immigration permits.

Yours truly,

(Signed) E. J. McMURRAY.

What action does the committee wish to take?

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, you consulted with me about the matter and I made it my business to see a few members of the committee and ask them what the opinion would be in regard to delaying calling this witness until the committee met again, as he did not seem to have any material evidence, after the receipt of Mr. McMurray's telegram, because all he would do before the committee would be to say that he had paid his money into the firm, and that we now know from the telegram. As far as I am concerned, I would suggest that the witness is not material, and that he be not brought before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable to the committee?

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. BOYS: I would not like to say that his evidence is "not material", but in view of what we have, I would think it was not necessary.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we withdraw the summons to Mr. Kolchin?

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. CAHAN: I would like to move that Mr. Egan be asked to produce before the committee the correspondence relating to the admission of these parties mentioned in Mr. McMurray's letter.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: I will second that motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to).

The CHAIRMAN: Now, in connection with the Rex vs. Alexander matter. Here is another report from the Clerk of the committee:

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
COMMITTEES BRANCH,
May 29, 1928.

W. F. KAY, M.P.,
Chairman.

DEAR SIR:—

Re Rex vs. Alexander files.

I beg to report action taken in the above matter, as follows:

The Committee by motion of May 22nd ordered that the proper officer of the court be summoned to attend and produce the record and exhibits filed in this case.

This action was taken as a result of a letter that appeared in the press stating that there is on the court files five immigrant permits issued to an agent of Hamilton, Ontario, on representations made by a member of the House from Hamilton, and receipts amounting to \$2,350 paid to the agent for these five permits.

Before issuing a summons duces tecum I ascertained that the papers had been transmitted from Ottawa to Toronto. I obtained a list of the exhibits which had been filed at the trial at Ottawa, and as such list did not indicate that any of the documents referred to in the newspaper report were on file, I wired Toronto agents to search the file of exhibits at Osgoode Hall and advise me if same contained any permits or letters purporting to have been issued or signed by the Department or any officer thereof, or receipts for money.

After search my agents sent me a list of the exhibits on file (18 in number) together with a copy of exhibit No. 10. They advised me that there were no permits, receipts or departmental letters, other than Exhibit No. 10.

It appeared from the information to hand that the exhibits filed in this case, other than possibly No. 10, were of no concern to the Committee and pending action on this report I deferred summoning the clerk of records from Toronto.

Attached hereto is the list of exhibits and the copy of Exhibit No. 10.

I should also report that I examined the Departmental file covering the case of Mirakian referred to in Exhibit No. 10 and there is nothing on that file to connect up the allegation of the five permits and receipts for money, nor can the Department officials, upon inquiry made of them, throw any light on the matter.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of Committee.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): What is exhibit No. 10?

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Have you a list of the exhibits there?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. I will read the list. (Reading)—

“Rex vs. Alexander—Trial at Ottawa, March 25, 1925.

Exhibit

1. Blank petition for naturalization.
2. Certificate of Naturalization, Garabed Mirakian, January 28, 1915.
3. Certificate of Naturalization to Mihran Garabed Mirakian, No. 8315, November 30, 1923, cancelled and revoked.
4. Letter from Alexander to August 29, 1923.
5. Letter from Alexander to September 29, 1923.
6. Passport.
7. Letter from Shekter to Under-Secretary, January 21, 1924.
8. Letter in Turkish.
9. Certificate of Naturalization.
10. Letter from Stewart.
12. Petition for naturalization of Mihran G. Mirakian.
13. Receipt from Mihran dated November 30, 1923, for certificate of naturalization No. 8315.
14. Letter from R. R. Forbes to Alexander, May 22, 1923.
15. Letter from J.S.F. to Alexander, March 13, 1924, reference to Egan.
16. U.S. Immigration letter, March 22, 1924, to Alexander.
17. U.S. Immigration letter, July 2, 1923.
18. Letter to R. R. Forbes.

“DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION & COLONIZATION

No. 131958 Im.

OTTAWA, March 10, 1925.

Dear Mr. STEWART:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 4th ult., with reference to the application of Garabed Mirakian for the admission to Canada of Kalust Mirakian and his wife Sarah, who were rejected at Paris.

In reply I beg to advise you that the Director of European Emigration in London has been advised to allow the above named to come forward. I am returning herewith the documents enclosed with your letter.

Yours very truly,

J. S. FRASER,

Div. Commissioner.

Enc.

T. J. STEWART, Esq., M.P.,

House of Commons, Ottawa.”

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

OTTAWA, March 12, 1925.

GARABED MIRAKIAN, Esq.,
30 Case Street, Hamilton.

My dear Sir:

I am in receipt of a letter from J. S. Fraser, Divisional Commissioner of Immigration, Ottawa, a copy of which is enclosed herewith.

You will see by the last clause that they have consented to allow the person named to come forward.

Hoping this will be satisfactory, I remain,

Yours truly,

J. T. STEWART.

Envelope franked
by T.J.S.

Then I have a letter here from Messrs. Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt, the agents to whom Mr. Fraser wrote, which reads:

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT

TORONTO, 2, 25th May, 1928.

A. A. FRASER, Esq.,
Clerk of Immigration Committee,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

DEAR SIR,—We did not receive your wire of the 23rd inst. until six o'clock on the afternoon of the 23rd and it was then too late to obtain access to the records at Osgoode Hall in the case of Rex versus Alexander. On Wednesday evening we attended on Clarence Bell, the Registrar of the Appellate Division, and with him endeavoured to obtain access to Osgoode Hall but through the absence of certain caretakers and officials who had access to the vaults in which these documents were deposited, we were unable to examine the same and the same situation prevailed yesterday, the 24th of May, this being a legal holiday, and we wired you yesterday to this effect.

This morning we examined the documents in question and found that two of the Exhibits, namely the passport and Certificate of Naturalization, had been returned to the owner. All the other Exhibits were either certificates of naturalization or petitions, letters or other naturalization papers, a list of which we enclose herewith. The only letter signed by an officer of the Department of Immigration was attached to a letter from T. J. Stewart to Garibed Mirakian which, together with the envelope addressed to Mirakian and franked by T. J. S., is Exhibit 10, and we enclose herewith a copy of Mr. Stewart's letter and also a copy of the departmental letter to Mr. Stewart which is attached thereto. We wired you to-day advising you as to this and enclose herewith confirmation copy of our wire. If there is any further information which you require on this matter we will endeavour to obtain and forward the same to you.

Yours truly,

(Signed) OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT.

Is there any further action to be taken with regard to this matter? Shall we recall Mr. Egan?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Chairman, I understood the matter to which you have just referred is a matter of court record in the city of Ottawa?

The CHAIRMAN: No; the papers are all in Osgoode Hall.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The action took place in the courts here?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): In that, if I understood correctly, certain documents were found on his person and were produced as evidence in the court, to the effect that a certain large sum of money was involved in the bringing in of these immigrants. In view of the fact that that matter was brought out under oath at the court here, why could we not have them placed on our records?

The CHAIRMAN: So far as I understand, you are basing your statement on a newspaper report. What was read to the Committee was a newspaper report.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): But I understood that the newspaper reporter took down the evidence, and his statement was from the evidence given on oath at the court?

Mr. BOYS: If I remember rightly, it was a letter which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* over somebody's signature, and I also recall that the person who wrote the letter made the statement that the pockets of the witness were examined in court, and five so-called permits were found upon him, and also a recommendation from a member from Hamilton. Now it appears that apart from the letter written by Mr. Stewart, the files, as searched by the agents in Toronto, would indicate there is no foundation whatever for the statement made in the letter read to the Committee with the exception of the one letter from Mr. Stewart. I regret that my memory is not extremely accurate, and I would ask Mr. Fansher to read the letter again.

The CHAIRMAN: It is in the records of the committee. We will have it read again.

Mr. ARTHURS: Would it not be possible to get the stenographic report of this trial so that we would have all the evidence before us? Although the exhibits might not be as mentioned in the letter, the evidence might be along that line.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: I do not know very much about court procedure, but there is no doubt that a receipt for money would be an exhibit?

Mr. CAHAN: The letter appears on page 683 of the proceedings.

Mr. BOYS: Will the clerk read it to us?

CLERK OF COMMITTEE: (reading):—

In the Spring Assizes of the Supreme Court of Ontario, held in March, 1925, in Ottawa, the pockets of one of the witnesses were searched by the order of the court and in his pockets were found five immigrant permits issued to an agent of Hamilton, Ontario, on representations made by a member of the House from Hamilton. Money receipts were also found in the pockets of this foreigner amounting to \$2,350 paid by this man to the agent mentioned for these five permits.

These permits were kept by the court and also the receipts and can be seen in the Osgoode Hall at any time. (See file *Rex vs. Alexander* No. 10, page 82.)

The signature does not appear here. I do not know whether it was in the newspaper report or not.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I understand that exhibits which have been listed by this firm of lawyers in Toronto were exhibits with regard to passports and naturalization and not permits at all.

Mr. BOYS: There is a certain file referred to in the letter and I understand the agents in Toronto searched this file, and there is no such matter on the file as was referred to in that letter. I think it is only fair to a former member of this House, who is now dead, that the public should understand that the letter which appeared in the Ottawa Citizen is without foundation, and the file does not show any five permits from the late T. J. Stewart, of Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I noticed that the exhibits jumped from No. 10 to No. 12. I was waiting to hear what exhibit No. 11 was. I heard afterwards that the certificate of naturalization and the passports had been returned to the owner and I assume those were the exhibits which were not there. The case seems to have been about passports and naturalization and not about permits.

Mr. BOYS: There is a very important bit of evidence which has come from Mr. Egan, who says that, as a matter of fact, the man who wrote this letter in the Citizen went to jail. I think we need not worry further about him.

Mr. COOTE: I presume this file will be open for inspection to any member of the committee, if they think there are any points to be cleared up, and it can be brought up again.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

W. J. EGAN recalled.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: I propose submitting to the Committee a list of members, giving the number of letters of assurance of employment following each name, and I want to make myself perfectly clear before submitting it. First, I have gone back to April 20th, from the time we put into operation clause 7, and not from June 1st. Secondly, I do this with some fear and trembling not knowing exactly what my rights are, but I want it definitely understood, if I may say so, that I am not submitting the names of members of my own free will. It was at the command of the Committee. All of these letters of admission—or rather, letters of assurance of employment—were granted legally either by the Minister or by myself, and I personally want it understood that I am submitting these names at the command of the Committee. I do not want any member to blame me for having submitted this, because those he has secured were secured legally.

Mr. BOYS: There is no reason why any member should blame you, because everything that was done was done quite legally.

The WITNESS: I feel that way, sir.

Mr. SPENCE: You were asked to prepare the list by the Committee, and you cannot be blamed for doing it.

The WITNESS: The third point is for the benefit of those who may know something about the list later on. Some of you will be in great alarm because of your understanding of the proposition. Let me put it this way: some members will have, for instance, "17" as granted opposite their names. They, as they know it, will think they have secured only three or four letters of that kind, but the seventeen they are given credit for is because those three or four may have been men with families, and as they think they have received only three or four permits and I announce them as having received seventeen, they may question it. The "3" has been converted into "17" because they represent seventeen immigrants coming into the country, seventeen individuals, and we keep our records in that way.

Mr. BOYS: Would the letter not state whom he wanted admitted?

The WITNESS: We named them in the letter to the immigrant, but it would appear as only one letter to him. For instance, if an application were made for a man and he had a wife and four children, our records would show six admissions.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Mr. BOYS: Would he not be cognizant of the total number?

The WITNESS: Yes, but I do not think the average member will read it that way.

Discussion, at length, took place.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): I would like to call the attention of the Committee to a court proceeding in Calgary where it was brought out that a certain man had been asked to go into a lawyer's office and there sign five applications for engaging farm labour. He had no intention of accepting those who were brought into the country and who would be thrown upon the industrial world. It is these things which have aroused suspicion and not what Mr. Brown has mentioned at all.

The WITNESS: May I just interject a word there? In connection with the point brought out by Mr. Fansher, I would say that that is the one thing I have been fighting all the time. That is one of the things I had hoped would be gained by the operation of the railway agreement. The steamship agents do go into the back country and for a fee get men to pretend they want certain individuals to come in as farmers. That is positive, and that we have been fighting tooth and nail from the beginning, and once you have this restrictive measure of confining it to that railway agreement, if the transportation companies live up to it, it will help materially. I have continually recommended that none but relatives of people on the land be allowed to nominate. It is now only a matter of \$2 or \$5 for a farmer or somebody who has somebody in hand whom he wants to bring over. I do not think there is very much "boodle," as we termed it in my younger days, but I do think it is for friends or relatives in the United States, who want to bring these immigrants in because they cannot get them into the States.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): I know that the Department has been fighting these things, but the public know of them, and I think, in fairness to the Immigration Department, it should be cleaned up, and I do not see how you can clean it up unless you go back of February, 1925.

The WITNESS: You can clean it up if Parliament gives me instructions that no application shall be accepted for Continental immigrants unless coming from their relatives.

The witness reads:—

The following is a statement of persons on whose behalf letters to facilitate entry were issued on recommendation of Members of Parliament, etc., for the period April, 1926, to April, 1928, inclusive.

Col. J. Arthurs, M.P.	32	Bowen, F. W., M.P.	2
L. M. Auger, M.P.	2	Bradette, J., M.P.	3
R. K. Anderson, M.P.	1	Beaubien, A. L., M.P.	35
A. Amirkanian, Brantford.	23	Berger, Samuel, Ottawa.	1
Armstrong, J. E., M.P.	5	Blatchford, K. A., M.P.	2
Hon. Dr. Beland.	1	Beaubien, Hon. C. P.	1
Brady, J. C., M.P.	1	Boudreau, Lucien, M.L.A.	21
Bancroft, L. P., M.P.	2	Bristol, Senator E.	4
Bell, Thomas, M.P.	2	Chevrier, E. R. E., M.P.	47
Pettez, Arthur, M.P.	1	Church, T. L., M.P.	1
Black, Hon. W. A.	1	Casgrain, Pierre, M.P.	14
Boys, W. A., M.P.	2	Cotnam, Dr. I. D., M.P.	34
Boulanger, O. L., M.P.	4	Cascaden, Dr. J. H.	18
Bothwell, C. E., M.P.	2	Cannon, Hon. Lucien.	4
Boivin, P. E., M.P.	7	Chaplin, Hon. J. D.	4
Blanchard, S., M.P.	2	Campbell, M. N., M.P.	1
Bell, Leslie G., M.P.	27	Cohen, J., Montreal.	1
Benoit, A. J., M.P.	19	Cayley, T. M., M.P.	1
Bell, C. W., M.P.	9	Chabot, Dr., M.P.	8

Deslisle, M. S., M.P.	8	Lawson, J. E., Toronto	5
Deslauriers, Dr., M.P.	63	Lepofsky, S., Ottawa	2
Dubuc, J. E. A.	8	McIntosh, C. R., M.P.	2
Dunning, Hon. Chas.	15	McCoig, Senator A. B.	14
Denis, Dr. Arthur, M.P.	87	McClenaghan, Stewart, Ottawa	7
Denis, J. J., M.P.	3	McGibbon, Dr. Peter	3
Duff, Wm., M.P.	1	MacDonald, Hon. E. M.	13
Dickson, W. G., Toronto	1	McDonald, Finlay, M.P.	12
Edwards, A. M., M.P.	5	McMaster, A. R., K.C., M.P.	50
Elliott, Hon. J. C.	1	McLean, M., M.P.	3
Euler, Hon. W. D.	208	McMillan, Thos., M.P.	3
Edwards, Gordon C., M.P.	93	Murray, Hon. E. J.	1
Ellenson, E. M.	10	Mercier, J. A., M.P.	119
Eisenberg, E., Toronto	5	Morin, Rene, M.P.	1
Fiset, Sir Eugene, M.P.	5	Murphy & Donald, Toronto	12
Montaine, Dr. J. E., M.P.	2	Malcolm, J., M.P., Hon.	27
Fraser, W. A., Trenton	1	McPhail, Agnes, M.P.	1
Freiman, A. J.	33	Manion, Hon. Dr.	2
Forke, Robert, M.P.	2	Maloney, Dr. M. J.	117
Guthrie, Hon. Hugh	80	Mercier, Paul, M.P.	68
Gordon, Hon. G. N.	18	McPhee, G. W., M.P.	120
Guerin, J. J., M.P.	16	Murdock, Hon. James	1
Gott, E. J., M.P.	11	Miles, Henry, M.L.C., Montreal	4
Goulet, A., M.P.	38	Massey, Hon. Vincent	1
Geary, Col. G. R., M.P.	35	Munn, W. C., Montreal	5
German, J. C. M., Toronto	15	McGuire, W. H., Toronto	1
Goodison, T. W., M.P.	6	Matthews, R. C., M.P.	8
Girouard, Mr., M. P.	2	Motherwell, Hon. W. R.	1
German, W. M., M.P.	2	Martin, Hon. John S., Toronto	1
Gardiner, Robt., M.P.	1	Margosches, Mrs., Ottawa	3
Gervais, Theodore, M.P.	1	Monahan, T. L., Toronto	33
Goldfield, B., Ottawa	12	Monte, P. F., Hon.	3
Garfunkel, Mr., Toronto	16	Neill, A. W., M.P.	5
Hatfield, Hon. P. L.	1	Odette, E. G., M.P.	20
Harris, Joseph, M. P.	4	O'Neil, J. Ray, M.P.	109
Hall, Dr. W. A., M.P.	2	Ornstein, A., Ottawa	11
Heaps, A. A., M.P.	85	O'Heir, Ald. Thos. J., Hamilton	2
Hall, T. F., K.C., Cobourg	24	Power, Chas. G., M.P.	17
Heenan, Hon. Peter	10	Pettit, G. H., M.P.	37
Hanson, R. B., M.P.	1	Pouliot, J. P., M.P.	7
Howard, Chas. B., M.P.	14	Preston, Dr. R. F., M.P.	4
Hay, F. W., M.P.	8	Price, A. B., M.P.	1
Harding, R. T., K.C., Toronto	13	Preston, W. T. R., Cobourg	10
Hocken, H. C., M.P.	76	Perley, Sir George	1
Homuth, Carl, M.P.P.	11	Perras, F. W., M.P.	13
Harmer, Senator	4	Prevost, J. E., M.P.	3
Hepburn, Mr., M.P.	6	Peck, E. A., M.P.	1
Hervey, General, contractor	300	Robinson, Col., M.P.	2
Hunt, J. J., Hamilton	1	Ross, J. G., M.P.	1
Irwin, F. H. M., Toronto	1	Rennie, Dr. G. S., M.P.	2
Jacobs, S. W., M.P.	143	Rheaume, J. T., M.P.	22
Johnston, F. G., Toronto	19	Rinfret, Hon. Fernand	31
Jelliff, L. H., M.P.	3	Ralston, Hon. J. L.	8
King, Hon. J. H.	26	Raymond, M., M.P.	15
Kay, William, M.P.	16	Robb, Hon. J. A.	15
Kaiser, Dr. T. E., M.P.	10	Robitaille, Clement, M.P.	16
Karam, S., Ottawa	8	Ross, A. E., M.P.	2
Kerwin, P., Guelph	2	Ryckman, Hon. E. B., M.P.	4
Lafamme, L. K., M.P.	14	Ryerson, R. E., M.P.	8
Lacombe, L., M.P.	2	Robbins, Major S. J.	29
Lang, Malcolm, M.P.	4	Rose, Bernard, K.C., Montreal	2
Lanctot, R., M.P.	2	Rutherford, Dr. J. W., M.P.	2
Lapointe, Hon. Ernest	14	Smith, R. K., M.P.	8
Lapierre, E. A., M.P.	31	Senn, M. C., M.P.	2
Lawson, Dr. Smirle, Toronto	33	Spence, D., M.P.	18
Lucas, W. T., M.P.	1	Shipway, Thos., Toronto	13
Leslie, Howard, Manitoba	22	Stinson, J. H., M.P.	13
Lennox, Col. Herbert T., M.P.	4	Stevens, Hon. H. H., M.P.	3

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Semple, G. H., Montreal..	4	Tobin, E. W., M.P..	1
Smoke, F., M.P..	1	Telford, W. P., M.P..	3
Sifton, Harry, Toronto..	2	Thorson, J. T., M.P..	3
Smith, Hon. Lewis, Fredericton..	1	Tobin, S. G., Toronto..	6
Smith, Arnold N., M.P..	6	Veniot, Hon. P. J..	15
St. Pere, E. C., M.P..	3	Vallance, John, M.P..	6
Simpson, T. E., M.P..	3	White, R. S., M.P..	8
Stewart, H. A., M.P..	3	Weiss, B., Ottawa..	7
Seguin, P. A., M.P..	6	Young, E. J., M.P..	3
Short, H. B., M.P..	4	Young, A. MacG., M.P..	6
Sanderson, F. G., M.P..	29	Young, Col. N. M., M.P..	7
Sinclair, Hon. J. E..	1		

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. I would like to ask one or two questions in connection with this list. What is the total?—A. The total is over the previous number, because I went back to April.

Q. I mean the total in the list?—A. The total in the list is 3,292.

Q. And any one of the 3,292 might be for half a dozen souls?—A. Half a dozen souls.

Q. And as to the permits, one permit, as you said before, might include four or five?—A. Very often in the case of continental families, six seven, eight or nine.

Q. Another question, is this; were these permits so-called, or letters of admission from a member of Parliament obtained by the members of Parliament and others mentioned in the list in a perfectly legal manner?—A. Absolutely.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. I have only one comment to make on the list, and that is, while I made two applications, I investigated them and took a great deal of trouble; I got permission in both cases, that they would be admitted, but I do not see them in the list, and I want an explanation.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Mr. Egan, the numbers given by you are the numbers admitted?—A. Yes.

Q. Are you sure that there were that number admitted?—A. No. Very often they did not come, for some reason or other.

Q. In one case I had a number of permits for men but before they got here they had drifted away to other localities?—A. Very often members receive letters for somebody, and very often they never come, but you have been credited with them, and I have been asked to give the list.

Q. Is it not true that the railway companies in certain cases advise their clients; for instance, a man sends money over to bring a friend from a foreign country through the railway company; they are advised by the railway company that in order to secure admission of this friend to Canada, the nominee must go to the local Federal member for assistance?—A. I think that only applies to limited circumstances; ever since the railway agreement came in they—

Q. I might say I acted on letters from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company advising that the party desiring the admission of a friend must secure the assistance of the Federal member; that is true?—A. To some extent.

Mr. BROWN: I am told that I must apologize, that my nominee did appear.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. I am credited with six; I am not denying it, but do you require six letters from me, or would one admit five?—A. I would have to look that up. There is not any question about it, that one might mean five.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Mr. McMILLAN: There is nothing here that would lead us to believe that there has been anything wrong in any matter that any of the members have been engaged in. In my own case, you will notice three. If my memory serves me right; they were the wife and two children of a Hollander, whose brother I am well acquainted with, and who has been in this country for seven or eight years, and they were exceedingly anxious that the wife and two children of this brother should come out. I think, as has been said already, that there is nothing in that, but what members of Parliament are entitled to do and did in these cases.

WITNESS: I have tried to make it clear.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. I would like to know whether all these are from non-preferred countries?—A. I beg your pardon?

Q. The question is, are all these entries from non-preferred countries?—A. Practically all, but there was a period last year when the railway companies more or less closed down, from all preferred countries, with perhaps the exception of—take the Hon. Mr. Euler's case, arrivals from Germany came in on the preferred list. If you care to speak of the people from Germany, they were not on the preferred list, but he had to make applications for these people. They were then, so to speak, of the non-preferred countries.

Q. Have you any idea of the percentage of the entries where the parties would be related to persons at the time residents of Canada?—A. Practically none. All these are related, within the class permitting admission of certain relationships; there would be remote relationships, such as cousins.

Q. I think Mr. Brown has referred to one or two?—A. But it must be a relationship, a cousin, a father, brother, or son.

Q. You could not say, without evidence, and finding out?—A. Yes.

Q. Was any effort made to find out how many were related to persons already in Canada?—A. No, sir.

Q. There is one in the whole list that prompts me to ask the question; if I remember correctly, the gentleman was from Montreal, and the number was 300?—A. Yes.

Q. What was the name?—A. General Hervey.

Q. Were they all at one time?—A. All at one time.

Q. Have you any idea why they were required?—A. Yes.

Q. Was it in connection with some contract work?—A. It was in connection with railway work. The application was made by General Hervey in the original case to Hon. Mr. Stewart. Mr. Stewart sent it to me, and I said to General Hervey that unless he was able to give me an assurance from the Labour bureaus that they had tried to get that help but could not—he must produce something which would warrant my saying to the Italian Government that these people would have work for at least one year—that I could not consider it. As you know, things were moving pretty fast just about the year 1926, in the Spring of 1926.

Q. Is he a contractor?—A. He is a contractor, a member of a contracting firm.

Q. Do I understand that the whole list was signed at one time and recommended by him at one time?—A. Yes.

Q. What was the date of it?—A. That I will have to look up.

Q. You do not remember at all?—A. No. It was in the Summer of 1926.

Q. You mean by that, probably July or August?—A. The change of Government was when? June, 1926. It would be towards the end of July.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Have you a record of what nationality they are?—A. Yes, they are all Italians.

Mr. HOCKEN: I am not a member of the Committee, but I would ask the privilege to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope members of the Committee or members of Parliament are not going to feel it incumbent upon them to come before this Committee and explain the relationship or why they got these letters of entry.

Mr. MCPHEE: We had better not start this thing.

Mr. HOCKEN: Mr. Chairman, while I am not a member of this Committee, I would like to say a word or two. About one-half the people in my constituency are foreigners.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: I would like to say a word or two on behalf of my friend Mr. Hocken. He made a lot of applications to me, and they were all absolutely bona fide.

Mr. HOCKEN: I would like to have Mr. Egan's opinion upon that.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): I would like to ask one question right here.

The WITNESS: May I answer Mr. Hocken first? My statement I think in answer to Dr. Edwards was that neither you nor anybody else could have got them from me if I had not considered that they were correct. Every permit I have issued, mentioned there, was considered legal either by myself or by my Minister, and yours, Mr. Hocken, were just as good as the other fellows.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that has been made clear by Mr. Egan, and I hope the members of the Committee will let that statement go.

By Mr. Anderson (Halton):

Q. If a member asked for permission for a person to come in, was it not their duty to certify that they were the proper persons to receive the immigrants?—A. Yes. We have confined it practically to that. There is no rule you can work out at 100 per cent but, it is 99 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. Then there was in each case the member who asked for it.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. The contractor applied for 300?—A. Yes.

Q. Did he specify the names?—A. No, he did not specify the names, it was to bring in 300 people for this particular railway construction work. Instructions were issued to the Italian Consul, and the Italian Government was notified that these men were selected. I do not know that they all came to the work, but I know that towards the end of their coming perhaps 90 to 100—General Hervey telephoned me one day that with what he had received and placed at work, and the other help secured, and perhaps a lessening of what was required, he was not quite in a position to stand by his arrangement, and wanted to know if I could place them with another industrial company. I said "yes, provided they are not displacing Canadian labour," and that they would guarantee a year's work at least.

Q. Are they under any obligation to find work for a certain time?—A. They are under a moral obligation to me but not to the individual who is mostly only too glad to come.

Q. You have no bond or guarantee that they will not become a public charge?—A. No.

Q. Nor is there any agreement to that effect to hold the contractor responsible?—A. No.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. It is only necessary to have these letters of admission from the non-preferred countries?—A. Yes, a man must come voluntarily on his own, from any other country.

Q. So that these are only required for people of the non-preferred countries?—A. Yes. I am a little confused upon that. I think last year letters were asked because immigration was stopped, in a general way, and I think from one or two countries north of the non-preferred, there were a few letters granted at that time.

Q. Under the railway agreement they can only bring in people from these non-preferred countries; as agricultural workers or to go on the land?—A. That is the whole purpose of the railway agreement. These people who come in under these letters are coming to assured employment elsewhere than on the farm. Perhaps during that period, when the railway agreement was not working, as far as bringing people out was concerned, we issued letters of permit for people to come in, but we never allowed them to come, departmentally, unless we investigated. If the person came as farm help, we would not investigate, we would take the member's word, or whoever's word we had to take.

Q. I am looking at your report, at page 11, and I want to get it clear as to how these people came in.—A. What year is that?

Q. This is the last one I have, for 1927. I did not take down the number from any particular country that might send agricultural workers. Where are the people called Magyars coming from?—A. The Magyars are Hungarians mostly, although they are scattered around in other countries.

Q. They would be more or less agricultural workers?—A. Yes, they should be.

Q. Arabians 4, Armenians 78, East Indians 62, Greeks 385, Italians 3,466, Jews 4,863, Magyars 4,940, Maltese 34, Persians 6, Portuguese 18, Spanish 49, Syrians 241, Turkish 10. I think the Committee will agree with me that it is not reasonable to expect the people from those countries will go on the land?—A. No, they have not.

Q. That makes a total of 9,416 for the year—1926-27. How would those people get in?—A. There must be one or two big bulks in that.

Q. Italians 3,466, and Jews 4,863. You will find that on page 11.

Mr. BANCROFT: Do you say none of these would go on the land?

Mr. LUCAS: It is not reasonable to expect those people from the countries I have mentioned would go on the land.

Mr. ROSS: These Italians are amongst the best farmers we have. The Italians are some of the best farmers. Anybody who says Italians are not farmers is wrong.

Mr. LUCAS: I do not say Italians are not farmers, but they would not go on the land in large numbers. I think my statement will be borne out by the census of Canada.

Mr. BANCROFT: I know where 12 Italians came into Manitoba and bought a piece of land operated by Mr. R. J. Spiers, and those men are farmers.

WITNESS: As far as the Italian is concerned, I can only explain approximately; I have no doubt that at least 35 per cent to 40 per cent of those Italians who came in that year are on the land right now, because I know the different movements. I believe, in fact I know after inspection, that there are a goodly number, and I know that the balance came in pretending that they were coming to farm work; so that, as far as we are concerned, after investigation, they came in legally.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. In that same period, what was the total immigration to this country?—A. I have that here; it was 143,991 in 1926-27.

Q. But on the so-called letters of admission?—A. It would be easily 300,000; it would be about 265,000. I am speaking of twenty-four months from April. It would be about 300,000.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. I would like to ask about General Hervey's crowd that he brought in; did he give to you or to the Department any guarantee or undertaking in regard to the wages paid?—A. No. In the long run, that was my anxiety while he was dealing with me in connection with it.

Q. I mean in bringing them in, when he said he wanted 300?—A. I inquired what wages were to be paid, and so forth.

Q. So your Department does take that into consideration?—A. Absolutely.

Q. In regard to the admission of large numbers for construction work?—A. Yes. We will not sanction it without investigation.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. You often consult with the Labour departments?—A. Yes, and I have said that in my evidence two or three times. We always, Dr. Edwards, insist upon certain information from the applicants, as to their bona fides and we insist upon certain documents being produced from the Labour bureaus in the provinces in the East. I would like to say something about the industrial company, or the chemical company—I think you mentioned the word "chemical". That does not appear here, that 100 do not appear upon this list, because we investigated it, and we had the Labour bureaus come across with the information that the help could not be secured, and the department was satisfied that they were absolutely required for that work.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. There were certain permits in my name; they were practically all for the chemical companies?—A. Yes, that was previous to the 100.

Q. They were included in the same way?—A. Yours were, so far as I remember.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. Is it not a fact that any immigrant in the country can without any permit bring in his father or brother, sister or unmarried children, children who are single, from any country, without a permit?—A. Yes, if it is within the law, he may.

Q. Without any recommendation?—A. They do not have to be recommended. They must produce proof to us of what they state. If that is produced, we allow them in.

Q. They do not have to come in under the occupational clause?—A. No.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: This occurs to me, Mr. Chairman. For instance, take the 300 that came in at the request of General Hervey; when the regulations were fairly tight, I mean under the present regulations. That confirms me in my conviction that previous to the tightening up of the regulations, very large numbers were brought in in some such way as that, and it convinces me that we should go back and ascertain whether that is the case or not. I am perfectly willing to let my motion rest until next meeting, and the members can give it some thought.

WITNESS: May I make that point clear? I am afraid that I did not, in my answer. From October, 1923, to April, 1926, there was no such movement of people under my jurisdiction without investigation, and on this particular movement I was instructed to carry on.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. I am not questioning the propriety of it?—A. Nor am I, in any sense of the word.

Q. But the change in the regulations had a tendency to tighten things up; that is the way it struck me. It was a little more open under 183 than it was afterwards?—A. The railway agreement having come into force, that was the only reason for the change. The railway agreement having come into force, we felt that the continental movement was big enough, and that it was helping up to some extent in so far as we did not have the same number of applications to contend with. Mr. Stewart and I talked the thing over, and decided that it would be only where we had an absolute guarantee of employment, or, as Mr. Forke afterwards did, confine it to members of Parliament and responsible people.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Would Jews coming from Germany be classed as Jews?—A. Yes. The Jew coming from Germany is a Hebrew.

Q. Regardless of what country he comes from?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. How did those Jews come in? Did they have letters of admission?—A. A great many came to relatives. Sometimes a man comes in and leaves behind him a large family. Perhaps one-half of those were movements to relatives, people who came in two, three, four, five years, and some even eight to ten years ago; that would be the greater movement. The next movement was of those coming, not relatives, but in a special way continental people. Anything in the shape of a cousin is a relationship with them, more especially if they are asking for a favour. In that case they would come only where there was an assurance of employment for them. This may seem strange to you, but it is encouraging to me, that some of them are coming to farm lands bought by the Jewish Immigration Society.

Q. A cousin or a relative coming to Canada requires no permit?—A. Yes, a cousin does. Any Hebrew coming in would be on this list because he is not allowed to come in under the relationship clause. He would have to assure them of employment without detriment to other Canadian labour.

Q. In looking over this list on page 11, you see the large number I read there of 9,216 of these people. Of course, there are a large number of others from the non-preferred countries. So many of these people are coming in, and yet there is no record?—A. There is no regular permit to a relative coming in; under the Act, a husband coming to his wife and children is not a matter of permit. I tried to give you the proportion; I would say among the Hebrews a little more than one-half easily, and the greater part of the others, perhaps 15 per cent, because they were coming in to form groups in a farm settlement, and the balance to assured employment. I said the other day, they were mostly Italians, Hebrews, Armenians, and others of that kind.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. These 9,000 are not out of the total of 143,000?—A. These 9,000 are out of the 143,991.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Would not a lot of those people come in under the railway agreement?

—A. No, sir. Italy is not in the railway agreement. If these are all the questions you have to ask on this, I will go on with something else.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. On this list I have here, none of them are under the railway agreement, they are really from the countries that you might say are almost the prohibited class?—A. When you tell me that a Northern Italian is non-permissible for this country, you have not had any experience, I think, because I would just as soon have a Northern Italian as any Swede, German or Dane that ever came into the country. I would say we must not move towards too free a movement among certain Italians, if you need them for settlement; if you need them for railways or for digging drains you cannot get anything better than Italians.

Q. Well, leave them out?—A. The Hebrews are next. You mentioned the Arabians, four in number. I cannot tell you how they are here. I would have to look that up for you, but probably relatives; Armenians 78, a very small number when you consider the thousands of applications we have for them to come in. Austrians 530, a very, very small number; they are from a non-preferred country, it is true, but they are of the same type as the Germans. What was the next type you mentioned?

Q. East Indians, 62 in number?—A. I will venture to say that if you followed us in all of the endeavours made with the East Indians, you would think that we had done very well in limiting it to 62, and that the 62 were pretty well limited in their movements. A considerable pressure is brought to bear in some localities, from the mayor down. What was the next one?

Q. The Greeks?—A. 385 in number. I hardly know a member in the House or a representative citizen in any town in Canada but who is prepared to vouch strongly for the bringing in of a Greek to a relative, outside of the regulation relative to helping him in his particular business. To my mind this figure is quite limited, when one considers the endeavours that are made to bring them in. What was the next?

Q. Italians.—A. That has been explained.

Q. The next is the Jews?—A. That has been explained.

Q. The next is the Maltese, 34 in number?—A. They are people within your Empire, and we have held the number down pretty well.

Q. Persians next, six in number?—A. I cannot tell you how they have come in. I would have to look that up for you. If there was anything astonishing in it, I would know all about it, because they could not come in without my knowing something about them.

Q. Portuguese, 18?—A. We have applications for hundreds and hundreds of Portuguese, and that is the result.

Q. Spanish, 49 in number?—A. That must be to relatives entirely.

Q. Syrians, 241?—A. The Syrian is in the same class as the Armenian, practically the same.

Q. Turkish, 10?—A. That I cannot explain, unless it is somebody in business here making sweets for us.

Q. The point is that must have been a pretty free movement when there were since April, 1926, in two years, that number?—A. Yes, from April.

Q. And there were in two years, practically permits for only, 3,200?—A. 3,292.

Q. The point that struck me is that there were 9,000 that came in last year from the countries I have just named, in one year, so that there are a large number of people coming in apparently who do not have to get permits.—

A. Yes. I would just like to clear that point up. They are coming to their relatives, which is within the law, and that is one of the very reasons why we are trying to make these other movements as light or as tight as we possibly can, because we do not want too many to come in who have the right to ask for their relatives.

Q. They are not like the Chinese—everybody they meet is a relative?—

A. Try it and see.

The CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn until 4 o'clock this afternoon, when we will consider the Grain Act, and the Committee will meet to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock to consider Immigration.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned.

Q. Well, leave them until—A. The Hebrews are next. You mentioned the Hebrews in number 1. I cannot tell you how they are here. I would have to look that up for you but probably relatives; Armenians 28, a very small number when you consider the thousands of applications we have for them to come in. Austrians 530, a very small number; they are from a non-prefixed country. It is true, but they are of the same type as the Germans. What was the next type you mentioned?—A. I will continue to say that if you followed us in all of the endeavors made with the East Indians, you would think that we had done very well in limiting it to 82, and that the 82 were pretty well limited in their movements. A considerable pressure is brought to bear in some localities from the north-west. What was the next one?

Q. The Greeks—A. 325 in number. I hardly know a member in the House of a representative class in any town in Canada but who is prepared to vouch strongly for the bringing in of a Greek to a relative outside of the restriction relative to bringing him in for particular business. To my mind this figure is quite limited when you consider the endeavors that are made to bring them in. What was the next?

Q. Italians—A. That has been explained.

Q. The next is the Jews—A. That has been explained.

Q. The next is the Maltese 34 in number—A. They are people within your Empire and we have held the number down pretty well.

Q. Turkish next six in number—A. I cannot tell you how they have come in. I would have to look that up for you. If there was anything establishing in it, I would know all about it, because they could not come in without my knowing something about them.

Q. Portuguese 127—A. We have applications for numbers and perhaps of Portuguese and that is the result.

Q. Spanish 40 in number—A. That must be to relatives, certainly.

Q. Serians 217—A. The Serians is in the same class as the Armenian, practically the same.

Q. Turkish 107—A. That I cannot explain unless it is somebody in business here making errors for us.

Q. The point is that there have been a pretty free movement when there were since April 1926, in two years, that number—A. Yes, from April 1926. And there were in two years practically permits for only 3,200—A. 3,200.

Q. The point that struck me is that there were 6,000 that came in last year, and the committee have just made in one year 6,000 that there are a large number of people coming in apparently who do not have relative permits—

[MRS. W. J. WILSON]

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, May 30, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I want to state again very briefly the reasons why I submit my motion, seconded by Mr. Lucas. In April, 1919, the British Government gave free passage to approved ex-service men and their dependents. That scheme closed at the end of 1922, some 82,000 having been granted free passage to the several overseas dominions. That was a purely British scheme. In 1921 there was a conference of Premiers of the Empire held in the Old Country and they considered this question of immigration and recommended co-operation between the mother country and the overseas dominions, and the framing of a policy of Empire land settlement and Empire directed immigration. As a result of that conference, on the 31st of May, 1922, the Empire Settlement Act became law, although it did not really get under way for perhaps two or three years, as is shown by the figures. For instance, under that Empire settlement scheme in 1925 only 8,779 came to Canada. A few might have come out before; I have not the figures for 1924 or 1923. However, it got under way the next year, in 1926, when 20,862 came out under that scheme. In the next year, 1927, 29,244. Now that comes in, as you will observe, since the operation of P.C. 183. In 1924 the Empire settlement scheme involving assisted passage schemes, the Three Thousand Family Scheme, and the New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Land Settlement Scheme, all grew out of that; the Clan Donald Scheme, the Alberta Training Scheme, the Ontario Vimy Ridge, and the movement of the Boys' Land Settlement Scheme. A new Empire Passage Scheme was brought into effect on January 1, 1926, as a result of this, between the Department and the Overseas Settlement Commission. The war, as I said yesterday, naturally held up everything and the figures will show that there was practically no migration during the years of war. Immediately following the war, in the Old Country and with the overseas dominions trying to get down to business again, this matter of migration was actively taken up, not only by the Old Country but by Canada, Australia and New Zealand, there being a desire on the part of the British Government, as evidenced by the conference and the subsequent scheme of assisting their own people, to settle in the overseas dominions, which would relieve the situation in the Old Country and be of assistance to the dominions as well. I submit that these new schemes following after the war really became actively operative with P.C. 183, about the year 1923. I think there is ample evidence to show that during 1923, 1924, 1925, and 1926, various plans were discussed between this country and the Old Country and various schemes were tried out, and it does seem to me to be a part of our duty as a Committee to ascertain as far as we can by statistics and other facts just how these various schemes operated, to what extent they were effective and to what extent they were ineffective, and it seems to me we should go back to 1923. I have no wish to limit it to February of 1923 when P.C. 183 came into operation, if you want to go back, but I repeat that the facts are all there to show that the activities in regard to immigration and the inculcating of

various new schemes took place along in 1923, 1924 and 1925. That is the reason why I make my motion. I think it is our duty to go back and inquire into these schemes and get the results of the migration under the various plans, to ascertain why these plans were abandoned or changed for other plans, whether they worked out better under the new plan than under a former one, and so forth. That seems to me to be a main part of our work here. If you want to go back of that I have no objection at all, except the one indicated by the Deputy Minister, and which I fully appreciate, that it means a good deal of work and time. Of course if we go farther back it will mean more work and more time. That is the reason why I proposed my resolution, and I would like an expression of opinion from the Committee on that resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you repeat your motion Doctor?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The motion was to the effect that the information which was contained in the report read to us yesterday by the Deputy Minister of those who came in under permit or any other way, sponsored either by members of Parliament, or by others not members of Parliament, should be extended and that we should go back to the date of the passing of P.C. 183, which, I think, was in January although it did not become operative until February 15th, 1923; so I would change my motion to read February, 1923, instead of January 1st, 1923.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: I do not know just what my hon. friend considers necessary now. The motion yesterday was for the filing of the permits back to 1923. I may point out to my hon. friend that he has not mentioned permits this morning and all the information that he has spoken of this morning, the numbers coming under the various schemes, is already in evidence in the reports of the Immigration Department. There are special files of all these matters. That is, the numbers who came under the various schemes are here under our hands. Any further information I am quite prepared to get but my understanding yesterday was entirely different from that suggested this morning. I understood that what was asked for yesterday was simply the number of permits that were issued for people who came from foreign countries and were not shown on that list that we have there.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Well, I say the same information that was given to us in the reports or lists that are here.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: May I say that all the people coming from foreign countries are listed here, during all these years. I understood the information asked for was the number of people coming from non-preferred countries going back to a certain date. So far as the information requested by my hon. friend this morning is concerned, I say that ninety per cent of it is here before us for our consideration now. But I have no objection in the world, as far as I am concerned, because I am as much interested as anyone else—indeed I am prepared to ask for it in the House of Commons—if we ask for a return showing the number of people coming from non-preferred countries into Canada; none in the world, if it is going to help the Committee; but I say it will not help us now in preparing our report to the House of Commons. But if it is deemed necessary by anyone, I am prepared to back the motion to bring it. It can be used at another session. I do not think it can be prepared for this session, but any further information that can be got and is urgently necessary for the Committee—information pertaining to the schemes, asked for by my hon. friend this morning may be helpful, but I maintain that the bulk of what he is asking for is already here. If there is anything not included in the bulk of what is before us, it is on record in the department but it may take some time to compile it. It has taken a long time to prepare this return and my information is that it would take 25 or 30 people two or three months to prepare a return of the character desired. If it is necessary let us have it. But I do

want to say this, if it is a case of simply showing what the permits were that were granted under the various governments then I want the motion to call for the information back to 1912, because that is about the time the migration started; or after the war.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I am to blame for not expressing myself exactly and hence the criticism offered by the Hon. Mr. Stewart. What I intended to convey was this, both yesterday and to-day. We want the information, of the same class and character as that given by Mr. Egan yesterday, extended back to the date of operation of P.C. 183, which would be February 15th, 1923. I mentioned these other matters and it appears to me to dove-tail in with or would have some influence on the permits. I mention the date for that purpose. That is the way it appears to me. I want to know, and I believe others want to know, to what extent permits or letters of admission such as were referred to in the report given to us yesterday were made back of April, 1926, not merely by members of Parliament, but my candid view is that it was outside of members of Parliament, those not responsible to Parliament at all. If there was any abuse those were the persons who abused the permit system, and I want the return to apply back of April, 1926, to satisfy myself and others in regard to whether or not that which was considered the right policy was abused previous to that date. Now, that is my motion. I know we cannot get the information in order to use it for our report at this session, but we can get it and have it by next session and at least we will show to the public that we are desirous of cleaning up the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: I have no objection to that and if the return goes back to 1920 I will second my hon. friend's motion.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Very well, then I will be very glad to change the date as suggested.

Mr. LUCAS: I will agree to it if the statements are brought down by months; the figures given by months. It will not require any more work. We have all the figures and it will mean simply that each month will be segregated. In other words, if we get whatever the number is, any bulk figure, we will have no idea then what it means.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Each permit takes some considerable time to look up. They might have come in three months before they were finally dealt with.

Mr. LUCAS: Then, why not say the number of applications per month?

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Do you mean the applications granted, or do you mean the number of permits applied for?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Just the same as this return. We were told distinctly yesterday that this contained applications; permits applied for. So follow the same course as the other; just the same course as you followed with that but let it go back to the earlier date.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Mr. Lucas is introducing something new. There is a considerable difference in compiling them month by month. I think Mr. Egan will bear me out there. But if you are satisfied with the numbers who came in between the first and the last of each month, then the return will be more easily prepared. Am I right in that, Mr. Egan?

Mr. EGAN: Oh, yes, it will entail a lot of work. It is a terrific task.

Mr. LUCAS: I understand those returns yesterday were just those granted?

Mr. EGAN: Yes. We might have had more applications.

Mr. LUCAS: You may have had more applications during that period?

Mr. EGAN: Very many more.

Mr. LUCAS: You only furnished those granted?

Mr. EGAN: That is all.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Then, my confusion was that these applications were granted, but they did not all come?

Mr. EGAN: That is a different point, sir, that he is making here.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: All right, leave it to those granted.

Mr. LUCAS: I might make application for a permit and Mr. Egan might turn it down. Therefore, that was something that was not exercised.

Mr. VALLANCE: An application might be made for several people, say six, and it might be granted as to five. These yesterday were individuals granted, not applications. I understood it was said yesterday that one application might have meant six.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: He said he might make five applications and one person come in.

Mr. EGAN: I cannot answer that back of 1923. I can from 1923 on.

Mr. BROWN: You are introducing another complication. A member or some individual may apply for a certain number and some of these would extend over a great length of time, some granted in one month and some in another and they do not coincide with the time the applications were made. You are introducing another very confusing factor into the problem.

Mr. JENKINS: I understand the resolution is, those that were granted month by month.

The CHAIRMAN: I will read the motion as I understand it. It has not been presented in written form.

It is moved by Hon. Mr. Edwards that the Department file a list of letters of admission issued, and the names of the sponsors thereof, dating back to January 1st, 1920.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Just put in, in order to cover that properly; did you say, "issued"?

The CHAIRMAN: Issued. The list of letters of admission issued and the names of the sponsors thereof.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: The list of letters of admission issued, and granted?

The CHAIRMAN: And the names of the sponsors thereof.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: If an application is made, is it issued?

Mr. EGAN: Issued by him. Not by us.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Mr. Egan thoroughly understands the work entailed, and it seems to me that all the Committee desires would be the number of entrants from these foreign countries by months. What is the use of dealing with applications that never were granted and the parties did not come?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Applications granted.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Just the ones from which the parties arrived in Canada.

Mr. BANCROFT: It should be the same as the list brought down yesterday or else it is of no use for purposes of comparison. I understood Mr. Edwards wanted to extend the time over other years. Now, why not bring down the same nature of information?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: It will be of the same nature.

The CHAIRMAN: Have I this motion correctly worded?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Unless you use the word "granted" instead of "issued".

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Will you state, Mr. Egan, how long this work will take?

Mr. EGAN: Well, gentlemen, my average mail is forty-two thousand letters a month: forty to forty-two. I have thirty-one men employed on that task, and to cover that which is asked for to-day will mean engaging temporary

officials to take their place for at least four to six months. I cannot tell you definitely what I can do in the shape of giving you facts in detail as to the sponsors et cetera. What I can do is to prepare a statement of the order of yesterday's, in so far as I can, from the files, dating from 1920. If I take ten or twelve men only to work on the task, it will take at least five or six months. I notice the all-wise people, in one or two editorials, suggest that our filing system must be in a very peculiar unbusinesslike shape if we cannot do it in a very much quicker time. As a matter of fact, we have had only cross entries for certain purposes. If something is granted within the law it goes in as an every day affair and filed only under the name of the individual to whom it is granted. Therefore, we will have to pull every file in the Department, which means hundreds of thousands of files, to take me back to 1920. As long as it is only for the next session of your Committee, at the next session of Parliament I can have it ready for you.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: What I want to get from you is this: can you give us the number coming in month by month?

Mr. EGAN: I think that is almost an impossible task.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Can you get it by the usual statistical years?

Mr. EGAN: Yes, I can do that. What we would have to do is to go over all the files and get certain facts. Then we would have to divide them into yearly proportions. If you ask me to go over the facts and divide them into monthly statements I can do it from the very beginning but it would entail a longer period of time in doing it and I am afraid that it would not be complete, I must plead guilty to the fact that I cannot tell you just what the shape of all the files is previous to my taking hold of them.

Mr. BROWN: Could you make up that information of the total number that would come in in any fiscal year, with the names of the members or other individuals who have made the applications, to provide something for comparison with what you have given yesterday

Mr. EGAN: Yes, I can do that, but it will take a long time. It means pulling every file in the Department back to 1920 and perhaps beyond that, because it may so happen that an original Continental resident of Canada may have made an application in 1919 and it may only have been granted in 1922, after several appeals, or after he had been here a longer time in the country. To get the results for 1920 and 1921 I may have to back in our files beyond 1920; in fact not may, but I will have to go back.

Mr. LUCAS: Mr. Chairman, I was the one who made the suggestion in regard to month by month. I thought when you were picking out these files it possibly would not require any more work to give it month by month than year by year. Now, after hearing what the Deputy Minister has said, I am prepared to withdraw that request for the information month by month, if we can have it for a yearly period.

Mr. EGAN: Yes. It means eight times the work of doing it as above; and and it would mean ninety-six times if I do it month by month.

Mr. LUCAS: I thought it would not be any more labour, if you had the figures, to do it month by month; but year by year will satisfy me.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I may say to the Deputy Minister that while we are putting a lot of responsibility and work upon him he may probably get some satisfaction out of the thought that he will be relieving the unemployment situation to a certain extent.

Mr. EGAN: I hope you will not forget that if I come to you for extra estimates.

Hon. Mr. FORK: I hope the Doctor will not object when it comes to the estimates.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: No, not after that.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I would like to point out to the Committee that in the record we have the return which was asked for by Dr. Edwards or by Mr. Cahan; in the early part of the session they asked for a statement of those coming in from the continent. It will be found in the record at pages 164 to 169, that is, by fiscal years. It begins with the fiscal year ended March 31, 1920. I suggest that this return be along this line for the same fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year of March 31, 1920, but with the additional feature Dr. Edwards speaks of, namely, those who are responsible for them.

WITNESS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Edwards' motion is, beginning with the fiscal year March 31st, 1920?

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Beginning with the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920, and for each year since.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: 1919-1920.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: For the fiscal year ending March 31, 1919.

The CHAIRMAN: Dating back to the beginning of the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who like to have any information whatever that will be of service to this Committee, in dealing with this question, but I would like to ask Dr. Edwards this: What will really be gained by a matter of this kind? The only thing I am thinking of is the endless amount of work, or the almost endless amount of work that will be involved. It will cost a great deal of money. If there was any purpose in it, I would say, let us have it by all means. If Dr. Edwards would let us know what advantage we might get from this increased work, I think we would feel much freer in having this large amount of money expended in this particular thing. If there is something, let us have it. I was not here before 1925, and I am not familiar with the question before that time, but we have before us a return made yesterday, which brought down all the permits issued, and all the sponsors, and even now I am not able to see just what bearing it has on the whole case. What I heard in the way of rumours was that somebody was trafficking in these permits. I find no evidence of any such thing happening. I would like to ask Dr. Edwards to be good enough to tell us what is to be gained by this additional work.

Hon. Dr. EDWARDS: The same question might have been put before this Committee by the resolution which brought the return, which was brought down by Mr. Egan yesterday; the same question might have been put as Mr. Young puts now. I indicated or gave a reason—perhaps it is too strong to dignify it with the name of a reason or just cause—but I said yesterday or intimated that I believed that in the past men not responsible to Parliament at all had obtained admission into Canada, not of ones, twos, or dozens, but of fifties, seventy-fives and hundreds. I have reason to believe that that is so, and I want to know whether it is so or not. I cannot make it as a positive statement of fact, but from what I have heard, I believe it to be the case, and I want to know whether it is true or not. If that is the way we have been getting our immigration into this country, we want to know it. We had a case yesterday where in 1926, when things were supposed to be tightened up, and these permits were issued to responsible members of Parliament, 300 were brought in at one crack, Italians. I do not want to say anything against Italians, but Italians are Italians. Those from the Northern part of Italy are good farmers, I believe, and they are very different from the people in the South of Italy, very different indeed. If we have returns showing admissions granted to responsible men, 145 members of Parliament, and some not members of Parlia-

ment, it is my belief that in times past those not responsible to Parliament at all were allowed to bring in batches of men from 75 to 100, and I want to find out whether that is so or not.

Mr. GLEN: Mr. Chairman, my recollection in regard to the inquiry into these permits was on the ground that members of Parliament were interested in permits, not referring back to 1920, but to present members of Parliament. I am in the position of not having had any issued to me, and I really do not see, Mr. Chairman, what possible gain is going to be obtained for the country in raking up things that happened away back in 1920. What I believed was the purpose of this inquiry was simply whether we should find some way or some method by which permits should be regulated in the future. What was produced by Mr. Egan yesterday showed that there was no trafficking as was alleged throughout the country and for that reason I shall vote against the motion.

Mr. BROWN: I thought, Mr. Chairman, that when this other list was produced it would tend to allay suspicions that had been aroused in the minds of the people of the country that something illegal had been going on by members of Parliament trafficking in permits. I think the Committee are satisfied that in the granting of these letters of admission there was nothing illegal, that there was nothing immoral, and that there was nothing that we should feel ourselves called upon to condemn. For that reason I thought I should vote against the resolution at that time. If Dr. Edwards would give us his suspicion that the permits granted in the past were illegal, then, we will have some ground for going back and investigating them. I know of course, the danger that confronts us, it will be said that we are afraid to go back; it is only fear of public opinion that has led us to go back as far as we have gone.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BROWN: Are we prepared to sacrifice or to expend what will mean a very large sum of money to get information which I think we are pretty well convinced will be useless information when we get it? We are just in this position to-day; we are so much afraid of public opinion that we are afraid that it will be said that we were afraid to go back. That is the situation as I see it.

Mr. ARTHURS: Dr. Edwards' motion is for the purpose of clearing up the debated question whether permits should be allowed at all or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. ARTHURS: That is one of the questions we have been discussing, and the question is whether we made a wise move when we added the present Order in Council to take the place of or to amend P.C. 183. Under P.C. 183, there were as many, or, as has been intimated, large numbers of permits were issued under P.C. 183; there is no doubt about that. I think the Committee would like to learn whether this has been a forward move, or whether the permit system should be cut out altogether. I think that is the primary idea behind Dr. Edwards' motion, and I am prepared to support the motion. I think we should find out whether we have the best system of admitting these desirable and undesirable people.

WITNESS: If I might be permitted to say a word in reference to Dr. Edwards' suggestion as to these permits being granted in batches of 25, 30, 40, 50 or 100 by the Department, I can assure him right now that there has been no such thing granted by the Department since 1923, in bulks.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: You granted them in 1926, to the extent of 300.

WITNESS: Those were on ministerial instructions, not departmental.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. Who was the Minister?—A. Sir Henry Drayton. Those were on ministerial instructions. I am speaking now of the Department only.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I would like to say just a word in reply to Mr. Brown. Since we have already advertised to the world our cowardice, or fear of public opinion, which amounts to the same thing, in trying to clear the skirts of the members of the present Parliament, it will not make much difference, so far as our reputation for cowardice is concerned if we go back and give a clearance to members of Parliament who have preceded us. If Mr. Brown thinks it was a shaking fear of public opinion that led us to ask for what we heard yesterday, if that is so, we are cowards in the sight of public, and we might as well be a little more cowardly and go back a little farther.

Mr. McMILLAN: As a member of the Committee, Mr. Chairman, if that is the idea that prompts us, the fear of public opinion, in going back farther, we are not fit to be here.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. McMILLAN: As far as I am concerned, I have lived long enough in the world to feel that if I am doing what I think is right, public opinion does not make very much difference to me.

"This above all; to thine own self be true, and it must follow as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

I was rather in favour of Dr. Edwards' motion before we heard the return yesterday, but after hearing the return yesterday, and, coming to my opinion as to the facts elicited, I am not in favour of spending money to go back any farther.

Mr. VALLANCE: As a member of the Committee, Mr. Chairman, I absolutely agree with what Mr. McMillan has said. The inquiry was in regard to members of Parliament who were supposed to be trafficking in permits. The evidence yesterday brought down by the Deputy Minister of Immigration cleared that away, and had this motion of Dr. Edwards not been introduced, I believe the public at large would have been satisfied with the statement given yesterday. But now that this motion is made, I question whether they will be. I see no reason why we should go back and do what Dr. Edwards suggests.

Mr. SPOTTON: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we go back as far as public opinion in Ontario demands it. We have a Liberal newspaper in Toronto known as "The Globe", a wonderful paper, which wants every moral issue to come out four square. The Toronto Globe's editorial yesterday tells us that we should go back of 1919 or 1920, and the independent press and the Liberal press all through the province of Ontario are demanding that we go back. Even on the Deputy Minister's figures, it is only going to cost \$3,000, \$4,000, or \$5,000 to do it—people can read over files at \$50 or \$60 a month.

An Hon. MEMBER: More like \$100 a month.

Mr. SPOTTON: It does not take a stenographer, a book-keeper or a private secretary to go over the files, but we will say \$100 a month to suit some of the members of this Committee. Say for five months, it would be about \$5,000. In this age, when we are pouring millions through the hopper, what will a few thousands of dollars mean in order to clear away this suspicion, to clear away what the editor of "The Globe" demands should be cleared away.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing improper or wrong in this Committee, showing fear of public opinion. I would be ashamed of this Committee if we did not show some fear of public opinion. We are here to bow to public opinion in this country, and if we evade this, we are only going against public opinion, and not doing our duty. Just because Dr. Edwards has raised the question, if for no other reason, I think we should go back, because certainly if this motion is defeated to-day, it will create a

certain amount of suspicion in the minds of people in this country. It will be asked, "what is the idea of us so far holding this investigation?" It is to allay suspicion in the minds of the public in regard to the Immigration Department. It is investigating the whole question of immigration, and, as Dr. Edwards says, we want to decide whether we have a good system of carrying on immigration or not. Certainly we should go back, as it is proposed. I think we have a perfect right to go back as far as we possibly can.

Mr. BANCROFT: I do not know all of these independent papers in Ontario, but I do read some of the papers published in different parts of Canada, and I have seen newspaper articles bringing up another feature of the matter, namely, that we have allowed this permit question to drag us away from the real work of the Committee, and the idea of bringing forward a proposal of some constructive kind before Parliament, has been lost sight of in pursuing this question of permits.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: May I say this, in reply to Mr. Spotton, that we will get evidence that will assist us on the permit question. We have in the return now the men who obtained letters of admission and we know the number of people coming in, and we will get this additional evidence if the Committee says so.

Mr. LUCAS: I quoted yesterday from the report showing that a large number from non-preferred countries came in last year without permits.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: A large number came in under the railway agreement. We have that to consider. For any gentleman to make the statement that this is going to help us to arrive at a decision as to whether we will continue permits or not, that will be of no value at all. I am one of those who are in favour of getting these returns; I would ask for them in the House of Commons. If they are going to be of any value in satisfying public opinion, or the press, I am in favour of the proposal. But it cannot be got in three months; it can be prepared during recess, for next session of Parliament. I think we are wasting a lot of time over it; we might as well go ahead and have the returns brought down.

Mr. BROWN: I am prepared to let it go, and when the time comes, I will be in a position to say, "I told you so."

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): The question of permits should not have been gone into at all unless we intended to go into it fully and have the returns ready. I am prepared to support the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the motion?

On a standing vote the motion was declared carried; 22 for; 7 against.

W. J. EGAN, called.

The WITNESS: Yesterday, Mr. Cahan moved that the file of S. Kolchin be laid on the table. This is the file; the letter with the corner turned down refers to the application. Shall I read the correspondence.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: May I suggest that the original file be left with the committee and any member can have access to it, and then the original can be taken back by Mr. Egan and a copy substituted later on.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It will not be embodied in the records?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I saw this file before we met, and there are two letters there which will give the gist of the whole thing. They might be read.

Letter from Messrs. McMurray & Company to Mr. Gellay, read and filed.

Letter from Mr. Gellay to Department read and filed.

Letter from Department to Mr. Gellay read and filed.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Is that the application for which \$75 in fees was paid?—A. That I know nothing of.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Before we leave the permit question I would like to ask a question or two. The agreement of the railways has been brought before this committee on several occasions. Does that apply to the western Provinces or to the whole of Canada?—A. The whole of Canada.

Q. Then under the terms of the agreement of the railways, all that is required is assured employment?—A. At farm work.

Q. Oh no. Do you mean to say that none are brought in except farmers?—A. You are asking about the railway agreement, as to who are brought in? That is a different thing. The railway agreement calls for the farmers or farm labourers with assured farm employment to be placed by the railways in Canada at that work.

Q. Do they follow that work?—A. Not always.

Q. In other words, if an application comes to a member of Parliament, he can avoid all responsibility—if any—by handing it over to the nearest railway or steamship agent, and have the man brought in through that channel?—A. Not now.

Q. Since when?—A. This year.

Q. By what means have you stopped that?—A. Because our officers decide as to the qualifications of the man for farm work. For the first two years of the railway agreement, they did not.

Q. What officers?—A. The Canadian Government officers.

Q. Where?—A. At Paris, at Riga, at Danzig, at Rotterdam and at Hamburg—five in all.

Q. And by what series of questions does he inquire into and acquire the knowledge of whether these men are liable to go on the farms or not?—A. It is not so much a question of liability, as to whether or not in his judgment he is able to fulfil the task. A man must be physically fit—

Q. That applies under the general law. A man must be physically fit to get into the country at all.—A. There are two lines of physical fitness. My purpose is to be as concise as possible and yet I am asked questions which require long explanation.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: You had better begin at the beginning; the examination which takes place by the railway agent, and the immigration officers, etc.

The WITNESS: We have been over that so often that I thought Mr. Arthurs was familiar with it. In answer to Mr. Arthurs, when I said "physically fit", I presumed he received the message I was trying to convey. I mean physically fit of the farm type, and not tradesmen in some other kinds of work, such as watchmakers, or clerks behind the counters. The whole proposition works out in this way, that before he secures the certificate from the railway official from the country from which he is coming, the railway official has investigated him as to his ability in that direction, and very carefully this year, because that man is liable to be sent back from the port at which he arrives on the Continent, if that officer has any doubts at all as to his intentions. The officer can tell within five minutes, or even within two minutes, whether this man intends to go to the United States, and not stay in Canada at all, and he may then ask him for his documents, or whether he has made an application in the past year to be vised into the United States, but if a man is apparently fit for farm life and farm labour, he allows him to pass.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: In the report of the Minister for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1926, out of the total immigrants arriving at ocean ports, 77,286,

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

only about one-half are designated as of the farming class. There are, roughly, 4,000 labouring class; roughly, 4,000 of mechanics, and only about one-half of the farming class.

The WITNESS: From the continent?

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Arriving at Ocean Ports?—A. Is that British and preferred countries, or non-preferred countries?

Q. I presume all of them (handing booklet to witness).—A. That is all of them. You do not require them to be of the farming class from any preferred country or the United Kingdom.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. The main entries under the railway agreement are largely from non-preferred countries?—A. Entirely so.

Q. I have in my room the figures for the C.P.R., which show they brought in approximately 40,000 under this agreement, of whom less than one-fourth were British. The balance would be from non-preferred countries?—A. Not if you are taking the total number they carried.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: There are no British under the railway agreement.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. It is no doubt true—and I think the Minister will bear me out in this—that the large proportion of the men brought in by the railways previous to this year have been employed in other than farm work. I might go so far as to say even a majority of them. Do you think that the present agreement will cut that out?—A. Undoubtedly it will help to.

Q. If so, in what manner will the railways get the labour they must have for construction and labouring work on the railways? From what source will they secure that labour?—A. I think perhaps the balance of the employment of which you speak as not being labourers will pretty well fit into any industrial requirements for this year and next year.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: The complaint we have is that the newcomers are going onto the farms, but as soon as they have been here a year they do not go back to the farms, but into other employment.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: They get into the country under the plea of going on the farms, and then leave the land the next year?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: We may as well face it; that is the idea.

Mr. ARTHURS: Does that apply generally to these non-preferred countries?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Oh, yes.

Mr. LUCAS: What is the date of the first railway agreement?

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: September 1, 1925.

The WITNESS: The 1st of September, 1925; it went into operation for the spring of 1926.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: I might suggest that Mr. Egan has a considerable amount of information to give to the committee, and some in rebuttal of statements which have been made and I think it would be well to get that information and then spend some time in questioning him on any matters in which the members are interested.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Does any of this information touch upon the railway agreement?

The WITNESS: I do not know of anything I am covering now relating to the railway agreement.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. I would like to ask if you have had any instances brought to your attention in connection with the railway agreement not working out satisfactorily in any number of instances?—A. Yes, time after time. That is why they have been checked up.

Q. I drew that from your remarks yesterday, but I was confused by your discussion this morning. In what respect has that not worked out? These men have not gone on the land or not been properly accounted for? Take that case in Calgary where there were five signed by one working in an office who had no intention to taking these people as they came out.—A. That is a very different thing altogether.

Q. I have here a complaint that came to my notice, and I think it should be placed on the record for the information of the committee. It is a letter written to me in connection with a village where seven Czecho-Slovakians were put off at the station, supposed to go on farms, and no one in the vicinity was there to receive them. This is a letter addressed to myself from the Secretary-Treasurer of the village of Earl Grey, under date of May 1, 1928. These men were brought in in May, 1927, just a year ago, and I want to bring this to your attention because I have had several instances brought to my notice, but this is the only one with whom I have corresponded. (Reads):

Earl Grey, Sask., May 5, 1928.

“ Mr. W. R. FANSHER, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Re Andrew Micklek Indigent Immigrant.

DEAR SIR,—I am instructed by the village council to ask you to bring forcibly to the attention of the Minister of Immigration the position this small village has been forced into through the C.P.R. dumping the above-mentioned in the village in May, 1927, without any provision for his maintenance and his subsequent admission to the Qu'Appelle Sanatorium at the expense of the village.

You will note by the copy of letter from the Commissioner of Immigration date April 2nd that he was accepted as an agricultural labourer and although he has been a year in the country he has not done one tap of farm work. You will also note by the affidavit of W. H. Wagner that there were seven men dumped here at the same time. They were all from Czechoslovakia, could not speak one word of English and were entirely without funds when they arrived.

Wagner had lived in the Ukraine in early life and was the only man who could talk to them, hence their dependence on him.

He says of the seven, one is working in Woodstock, Ont., as a machinist, two are in factories in Montreal, Micklek is in the Sanatorium and the other three may be at farm work, but the C.P.R. is still bringing them in as farm labourers.

The Commissioner of Immigration was notified by A. B. Cook of the Sanatorium on February 15, with a view to having the man deported but apparently the Department is in no hurry so long as the village pays.

In addition to the \$350 which has been charged up to the village by the Sanatorium, we are supporting a Canadian and his family, the father being sick with diabetes. This makes the Village Aid and Relief bill since last November some \$800 or four dollars for every man, woman and child in the village.”

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Now this situation, as I understand it, and I have reports from these workers, is repeated in several localities, and the Railway evidently is not accepting any responsibility for such cases as this. These people cannot afford to pay \$12 per capita in one year for assistance. If it were a case of their own residents, that would be a different matter, but here is a case where the man was brought over; it is said that he had tubercular glands and was under the doctor's treatment within a few days after his arrival. This case is a serious one and I wish to bring it before the Committee so as to give them some idea of what some communities have to contend with under this agreement.

Q. I wish to ask Mr. Egan if this has been brought to his attention. I understand they are doing everything in their power since it was brought to their attention to rectify the matter.—A. There is only one point in connection with this communication that I would like to clear up, Mr. Fansher. But before doing that I think it is just as well if I may suggest this: that the railway agreement came into force not only because the railways were working towards that particular purpose but because of the desire to co-operate with the railways in their efforts to get immigrants. I remember so well my first experience and how nervous I was on the floor of the House with my estimates and how unanimous every side of the House was and every group in the House was, that something ought to be done to co-operate with the railways for the bringing in of people for farm settlement. I know that my Minister discussed the thing with me on several occasions and I know the railways were working towards it and I am satisfied that when I received my instructions from my Minister, he was convinced that the spirit of the purpose which seemed to animate the House in discussing my estimates, as to the desirability of a co-operation of this kind, would be carried out. I have no doubt that the railways met with a great deal of difficulty by this everlasting sub-agent in the back country district over there, just the same as this difficulty you speak of in Edmonton. I have no doubt at all, I am convinced that the operation of the railway agreement in the first instance, giving them power of selection, was a mistake; but like every experiment, on finding the mistake we have checked it. I think from a business point of view that the railway agreement was a wonderful proposition. But I think the railways as business men were foolish from the business point of view; because if they had grasped that opportunity for real farm labour placing, or bringing farmers for settlement, and confined it to the four or five or six thousand they would have had by now a working proposition that would have meant real wealth of farm help required in the country, and in a bigger way; but they did make the mistake of listening to the call of a great many of these affidavits on this side, which to them appeared assured employment. Now after having gone through that experience in the first year, we had that promised last year that they would guard that and we continued the agreement as it was, with some little alterations such as you will find in your book, and this year the Minister took the stand that the railway agreement was still a useful proposition, but it would have to be checked up by the officials of this Department in respect to the men that were coming in. It may be that even this year, although the numbers are considerably less from the Continent, we may have some difficulty of that kind, but we are really tending towards something which means a co-operation towards the fulfilling of the requirements. That, I am convinced of, and that was the purpose of the railway agreement. I think it was a good intention, and if it had been held in bounds along, to my mind, business lines, it would have been a better proposition to-day both for Canada and for the interested transportation companies placing people along their lines. I may have gone too far afield in giving this practical and policy proposition; I am afraid I have stepped too far, but I wanted to make it clear from the beginning to the end what its purpose was.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. Is this the third year?—A. Yes, this is the third year.

By Mr. Fansher:

Q. I appreciate very much Mr. Egan's remarks but the point I wanted to raise here was that the railways, as I understood it, were being held responsible for the people that they brought out, and evidently they are evading their responsibility in this particular instance, which is duplicated all over the different communities in my constituency, at least.—A. The responsibility which they have undertaken is the placement of these men as farm labourers. That, you heard, they are prepared to undertake here. I am not going to try to discuss in any way the responsibility of assuming local charges because one could easily balance the ledger by telling of the two hundred that had been well settled in one district.

Q. I was not confining it to a specific charge. I was making the general statement and using this letter to back it up.—A. Your local authorities out there, in their letter, have suggested in connection with the moving of these men—you were good enough to let me see those papers—that we were in no hurry.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion? We have had it indicated to us by Mr. Stewart—and Mr. Egan indicated it himself—that they had an immense amount of information to give us in a general way concerning the workings of the department. He has started on two or three occasions to give us that information and each time he has been side-tracked and led away on to subjects introduced by different members. Now until Mr. Egan presents that clear statement of the affairs of his department and what they have been doing I suggest that the members of the Committee observe a self-denying ordinance—I know it will be hard for some members to do that—and refuse to interrupt until Mr. Egan has had a chance to make a general statement of the affairs of his department, that we are so anxious to hear.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the suggestion of Mr. Brown is very good.

The WITNESS: For the information of Mr. Fansher—and I know he will be good enough to hand it on to the secretary-treasurer of the village of Earl Grey—they state that the department is no hurry to deport the man referred to so long as the village pays. That is again an uncharitable interpretation of the fact. My officer tells me that this is really ridiculous, that we delayed deportation. In such cases we deport as quickly as possible. In the present case the man cannot be moved, that is the reason. We ordered his deportation and we are prepared to deport him, but if you cannot move him that is the end of it.

Mr. Chairman, I purpose now submitting to you first some data for your own observation in coming to your conclusions in connection with nominations and assisted passages as dealt with by the department. I have presumed in one or two cases to give a little more detail than the actual subject that I am covering.

TRANSPORTATION AND EMPIRE SETTLEMENT

The cost of transportation is one of the biggest factors affecting immigration from the British Isles and Europe. Before the war a third class passage from a port in the British Isles to a port in Canada cost approximately \$32; from continental ports, \$33. To-day the cost is \$87.50 from the British Isles and from the nearest continental port, \$112.50.

Before the war a settler, his wife and three children under twelve years of age could move from a port in the British Isles to Halifax, St. John, or Quebec for \$112 and to Winnipeg for \$160. To-day the cost

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

for the same journey (if unaided under any government scheme) to ocean ports is \$306 and to Winnipeg \$381. If the family came from Europe the pre-war cost was \$115 to Atlantic ports or \$163 to Winnipeg. Present costs are \$450 to \$525 respectively.

Such increases present a serious barrier to both British and European settlers. To many excellent families, through no fault of their own, such prices are absolutely prohibitive. Others, in moderate circumstances, are able to pay the transportation rates, but after doing so they have little left for settlement in Canada. Families well able to pay present costs of ocean transportation are not inclined to move in any large numbers.

Pursuant to the Empire Settlement Act of Great Britain passed in 1922, an Assisted Passage Agreement was negotiated between the British Government and the Dominion Government. The first Empire Settlement Agreements provided for loans, in whole or in part, to farmers, farm labourers and household workers. Under the present Agreement, loans in whole or in part are still made to families.

There are no loans to single farm labourers who receive the reduced rate.

Where considered necessary and advisable, however, loans to be shared equally by the British Government and the Dominion Government, may still be made to

- (a) families, but not exceeding the reduced rate.
- (b) household workers, but only to the amount of the difference between the minimum ocean rate and the migrant's contribution to the ultimate destination, provided that the loan shall not exceed £6. This means that a migrant who pays an ocean fare of only £2 to Halifax, does not receive a loan, but a migrant destined to Vancouver may receive a loan not exceeding £6.

Loans are free of interest and are repayable by instalments as determined in the circumstances of each case.

The Assisted Passage Agreement is applicable from the 1st of January, 1927, until the 31st of December, 1928. All migrants are approved both by a representative of the Department of Immigration and by a representative of the Oversea Settlement Committee.

Assistance is given towards the cost of passages to persons, male and female, provided that they are—

- (a) accompanied overseas in the case of married men by their wives and children, and in the case of widowers or widows by their children;
- (b) have been nominated by the Dominion Government or its Agents, or by British subjects resident in Canada;
- (c) have been nominated by any Provincial Government in Canada or its Agents, or by any organization approved for this purpose;
- (d) are migrating to settle upon the land or are women approved as household workers;
- (e) have been otherwise approved as suitable settlers;

provided that in exceptional cases where the Secretary of State and the Dominion Government consider it advisable, arrangements may be made for married men to proceed under this Agreement in advance of their wives and/or children, and for widowers and widows to proceed in advance of their children.

Adults.—Assistance towards the cost of transportation of adults takes the form of a free grant of a proportion of the cost of the lowest third class rate from the port of embarkation in the United Kingdom to the railway destination

in Canada, so that the rate chargeable to the migrant is based upon the following schedule to the centres mentioned:—

Destination	Amount		Regular Fare		—
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	
Halifax, St. John and Quebec.....	2	- -	18	15 -	
Montreal, via Quebec, St. John or Halifax.....	3	- -	19	15 5	(via Quebec)
			20	15 -	(via St. John) or Halifax
Toronto, via Quebec, St. John or Halifax.....	3	10 -	21	17 1	(via Quebec)
Winnipeg.....	4	10 -	22	7 11	(via St. John, Halifax)
			23	19 2	(Regina)
Regina, Moose Jaw or Saskatoon.....	5	- -	24	14 2	(Moose Jaw)
			24	15 10	(Saskatoon)
Calgary or Edmonton.....	5	10 -	25	1 8	
Vancouver.....	8	- -	25	14 2	
			28	7 9	

(The reduced rate is given only to adults within the meaning of the Agreement, i.e., those over 17 years of age who are coming to Canada to work on the land or to engage in household work.)

Explanation of the £2 Rate.

The Dominion Government gives a cash contribution of.....	3	10	0
The Steamship Companies give a rebate of.....	4	0	0
		7	10 0
British Government equation.....		7	10 0
Joint equation.....	£	15	0 0

In addition to the cash contribution of £3.10. the Dominion Government also contributes settlement service of an estimated average of £6.0.0 per migrant on account of aftercare.

Example No. 1.—Reduced fare for migrant going to Halifax.

Halifax—regular ocean fare.....	£	18	15	0
Joint equation as shown above.....	£	15	0	0
British cash payment as equation for after-care.....		1	15	0
		£	2	0 0

Example No. 2.—Reduced fare for migrant going to Winnipeg.

Regular fare to Winnipeg.....	£	23	19	2
Joint equation as shown above.....	£	15	0	0
British cash payment as equation for after-care.....		4	9	2
		£	4	10 0

In other words, the British Government equates by a cash payment the rebate of £4.10. by the Steamship Companies, the cash payment of £3.10. by the Department and aftercare service by the Department on an estimated average of £6 per migrant.

The reduced rate increased the number of Empire Settlement migrants from 8,408 in 1925-26, to 20,247 in 1926-27.

OTTAWA, March 19, 1928.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

NOMINATIONS

Assisted Passage in accordance with the terms set out above may be granted (inter alia) to approved migrants who have been nominated for this privilege by the Dominion Government or its Agents, or by British subjects resident in Canada.

Nominations are of three kinds:—

- Personal or Direct,
- Descriptive,
- Bulk.

A personal or direct nomination is that which a British subject resident in Canada makes for a known British subject resident in the British Isles, by name. Residents of Irish Free State territory are not in general eligible for assisted passages because the Irish Free State is not a party to the Agreement.

A descriptive nomination is that which a British subject resident in Canada makes for a British subject resident in the British Isles, exclusive of the Free State, giving only a description of the help he requires and not naming any particular person.

Bulk nomination is the system under which assisted passages are granted to certain migrants approved by Departmental Agents in the British Isles, exclusive of the Irish Free State.

The following classes of prospective migrants may be nominated:—

- (a) Families who will engage in farming or work on the land.
- (b) Single men to be employed as farm labourers.
- (c) Household workers to be employed in domestic service.

From the above it will be observed that "direct" and "descriptive" nominations may broadly be classified as "Nominations Arising in Canada," and Bulk Nomination "Nominations Arising Overseas."

Hereunder is a brief resumé of the procedure now in use by the Department for dealing with nominations under these headings.

NOMINATIONS ARISING IN CANADA

Special forms for the use of nominators are available on application to all Dominion Government Immigration and Land Settlement Officials, many representatives of Provincial Governments, all chartered banks in Canada and the representatives throughout the country of the two railroad systems. Copies of the forms in use are attached.

Publicity is being given to the Scheme through advertising in the Public Press and through the active efforts of the Field Staff of the Department by personal contact. In addition the co-operation of the Transportation Companies, the Hudson's Bay Company, the Salvation Army, the Church of England, the United Church of Canada, the Eastern Townships Emigration Society and other organizations has been secured. Attached is a copy of Departmental announcement appearing in the Press, and a copy of an official leaflet issued by the Department and distributed widely throughout the Dominion.

The procedure in dealing with the individual cases is as follows:—

The nominator, frequently with the assistance of the Departmental staff, completes and signs the form. The settlement arrangements proposed are immediately investigated, if not already known, by the Land Settlement Branch of the Department, and the form is forwarded with the recommendation of the District Superintendent to the Head Office at Ottawa. On receipt here the nomination is perused by an experienced Official, approval or otherwise is given, and if the former the nomination is endorsed and despatched overseas on the day of its receipt at Head Office.

The necessity for investigation in these cases may not at once be apparent. The Scheme, however, is made possible only by the contributions of public funds from the Treasuries of Canada and Great Britain. Upon the Department, therefore, rests the responsibility to the taxpayers of both countries to insure that the Scheme is not abused and that only those properly entitled under the Agreement are accorded its privileges.

"Nominations Arising Overseas" (Bulk)

Under this heading the Department deals with all cases of prospective migrants who intend to engage at farm or domestic employment, who have not been nominated from Canada, but for whom it has reasonable assurance of immediate placement on arrival at adequate wages.

For the current season the Department is permitting virtually an open door to all British migrants coming under these classes.

The Department has conducted a survey through its Land Settlement Branch to determine the absorption power of the community for the types of worker covered by the Agreement, resulting in a notification to its Overseas Agents that it will assume responsibility for the placement of all single experienced farm labourers that can be recruited through Departmental media. It has in addition assumed responsibility for the placement at farm work by its Land Settlement Branch of 150 married couples without children.

The placement of married couples with children presents difficulties largely on account of the housing shortage and inability of the average farmer to pay wages sufficient to board and clothe a family. For families nominated by Departmental Agents, therefore, the procedure is to send forward full particulars to Canada and to secure promise of definite placement before sailing.

In addition to the sources of recruitment residing in the Department itself through its regular representatives in Great Britain, the Overseas Offices of the Railway Companies, the Hudson's Bay Company and other organizations co-operate actively in Bulk Nomination.

During the winter various organizations notified the Department through its Land Settlement Branch of their ability to place at farm employment families and single men as under:—

	Families	Single Men
Canadian National Railways..	200	4,500
Canadian Pacific Railway..	500	3,500
Hudson's Bay..	1,350
Y.M.C.A. (United Church)..	300
Church of England..	150

This number has been increased since this memorandum was prepared by another 150.

(Reading):

Salvation Army, 200.

To insure against overlapping and possible saturation of the market at any particular point, the Land Settlement Branch conducted a survey throughout the country resulting in Departmental approval for recruitment through the Organizations named up to the full extent of their various requests.

In addition to the above the Department, by special arrangement with the Province of Ontario, permits the movement to that Province under Bulk Nomination of as many farm labourers and families as can adequately be absorbed under Provincial auspices.

OTTAWA, March 17th, 1928.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

NOMINATE BRITISH SETTLERS FOR ASSISTED PASSAGES

CANADA WANTS MORE BRITISH AGRICULTURAL FAMILIES, FARM WORKERS AND HOUSE WORKERS

Take advantage of your privileges as a British subject to nominate and thus help other British subjects from the United Kingdom who desire to come to Canada.

The Empire Settlement Passage Agreement offers the following rates to persons over seventeen:—

To Halifax, St. John or	To Regina, Moose Jaw or
Quebec..£2 0 0	Saskatoon..£5 0 0
Montreal.. 3 0 0	Calgary or
Toronto.. 3 10 0	Edmonton.. 5 10 0
Winnipeg.. 4 10 0	Vancouver.. 8 0 0

Children under seventeen years of the approved classes receive free passage

HOW TO NOMINATE

Secure the nomination form from your bank manager, any Immigration or Land Settlement official, any Provincial District Agricultural representative or a representative of a transportation company. (There are certain forms for families, farm workers and house workers). Fill in the nomination form and send it to your nearest Land Settlement office (See address below). Nomination may be made by name or by description.

The District Superintendents of the Land Settlement Branch are located at St. John, N.B.; Sherbrooke, P.Q.; Toronto, Ont.; Winnipeg, Man.; Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert, Sask.; Calgary and Edmonton, Alta.; Vancouver and Vernon, B.C.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, OTTAWA

N.B.—If interested in nomination, please keep this advertisement for future reference.

1928

D. O. File No.....
Imm. File No.....

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, CANADA

NOMINATION OF A BRITISH FAMILY UNDER EMPIRE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

NOTE:—This form may be used by any British subject resident in Canada. Three copies must be completed and sent to the District Superintendent, Land Settlement Branch, Department of Immigration and Colonization, at any of the following addresses. Address the nearest office:

- Maritime Provinces: St. John, N.B.
- *Quebec: Sherbrooke, P.Q.
- Ontario: Toronto, 32 Adelaide St., E.
- Manitoba: Winnipeg, Commercial Bldg.
- Saskatchewan: Regina, Veteran Bldg.; Saskatoon, Connaught Bldg.; Prince Albert, Harphill Bldg.
- Alberta: Edmonton, Blowey-Henry Blk.; Calgary, Southam Bldg.
- British Columbia: Vancouver, Winch Bldg.; Vernon, Megaw Bldg.

*Nominations arising in the Eastern Townships of Quebec may also be sent to the Eastern Townships Immigration Society at Sherbrooke.

(1) I, the undersigned British subject, do hereby nominate:—

Names of Adult Persons (17 years or over)	Age	Usual Occupation	Names of Children	Age
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Address of Migrants in British Isles.....
 (Give full Post Office and Street Address)

Occupation of Nominator.....
 Post Office Address in full.....
 Relationship of Migrants to Nominator.....
 If not related or acquainted with migrants, give name and address of person recommending family as suitable for farm work.....

I agree to become jointly responsible for the repayment of any passage loan given to the persons I have nominated and hereby guarantee that provision will be made for their maintenance and housing in addition to employment.

.....
 Signature of Nominator.

Offer of Employment

- (2) Is employer married or single?.....
If married state whether wife is living and number and ages of children at home)
- (3) Describe farm holding. Owner or renter?.....Size of farm.....
 Area under cultivation.....Class of farming.....
 Livestock carried.....
- (4) Housing accommodation. Is separate house provided for help?.....
 If so, state number of rooms..... Furnished or unfurnished?.....
 Will migrants live in same house with employer?.....
 If so, state number of rooms.....Furnished or unfurnished?.....
- (5) What farming experience (if any) must the migrants have?.....
(State whether required to milk, handle horse, take care of stock and use agricultural machinery)

- (6) Period of engagement.....Wages per annum.....at the rate of.....month
(Must be on yearly basis)
- Does offer include garden, milk and fuel?.....
- (7) State earliest date help wanted.....
 Latest date help will be accepted.....

Employer's Endorsement

I, the undersigned British subject, resident in Canada for.....years certify the above answers to be correct. I agree to provide employment on a yearly basis, pay wages offered, furnish accommodation as above stated and guarantee such conditions as will enable the persons concerned to make their way.

Date..... Signature.....
 Post Office..... Province.....

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

(A) REPORT OF DOMINION OR PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL:—
I consider the settlement arrangements.....
.....
(Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory)

(If unsatisfactory give reasons. If insufficient space attach Report)

Place..... Signature.....
Date..... Office.....

(B) I recommend this nomination be
.....
(Accepted or not accepted)
District..... Date.....
Dist. Supt. Land Settlement Branch.

(c) I.....concur
(Do not)
Date.....
Superintendent, Land Settlement Branch

(d) Director of European Emigration:
Approved and referred for necessary action.
Ottawa.....
(Date) Commissioner of Colonization.

D.O. File No.....
Imm. File No.....

1928

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION
CANADA

NOMINATION FOR BRITISH SINGLE FARM HELP UNDER EMPIRE
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

NOTE:—This form may be used by any British subject resident in Canada.
Three copies must be completed and sent to the District Superintendent, Land
Settlement Branch Department of Immigration and Colonization, at any of the
following addresses. (Address nearest office.) (See note on reverse side.)

Maritime Provinces: St. John, N.B.

Quebec: Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Ontario: Toronto, Ont., 32 Adelaide St. E.

Manitoba: Winnipeg, Man., Commercial Bldg.

Saskatchewan: Regina, Sask., Veteran Bldg.; Saskatoon, Sask., Connaught
Bldg.; Prince Albert, Sask., Harphill Bldg.

Alberta: Calgary, Alta., Southam Bldg.; Edmonton, Alta., Blowey-Henry
Blk.

British Columbia: Vancouver, B.C., Winch Bldg.; Vernon, B.C., Megaw
Bldg.

Nominations arising in the Eastern Townships of the Province of Quebec
may also be sent to the Eastern Townships Immigration Society, Sherbrooke,
P.Q.

(1) Name of migrant.....Age.....Occupation.....

(2) Address in British Isles.....
(Give full Post Office and Street Address)

(3) Relationship to Employer.....
(State whether relative or personal acquaintance. If not personally known, give name and address
of person who recommended migrant)

(4) What experience must the migrant have?
(State whether required to milk, handle horses, take care of stock and use agricultural machinery)

(5) State earliest date migrant wanted.....Latest date migrant accepted.....

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

- (6) Has migrant ever resided in Canada before?.....If so, state period of residence, date of departure and reason for leaving Canada.....
- (7) Describe your farm holding. Owner or Renter.....How long engaged in farming.....Housing accommodation.....Area under cultivation.....Class of farming.....Live stock carried
- (8) Nearest Railway Station.....Distance from farm.....
- (9) Period of Engagement.....Wages to be paid per annum \$.....
(Must be on yearly basis)
at the rate of \$.....per month.....
(State whether offer includes board, lodging and laundry)
- (10) Is migrant aware of this offer?.....If so, is he willing to accept.....
- (11) I, the undersigned, a British subject resident in Canada for..... years, certify the above answers to be correct.

Date..... Signature.....
Post Office..... Province.....

NOTE:—This form is prepared for the convenience of farmers requiring immigrant help and who may know of some person in the British Isles likely to suit. Those unacquainted in the British Isles may nominate by description and every effort will be made to secure the help required. In descriptive nominations the religious faith of the nominator may be stated if it is desired to secure a migrant of the same faith. Those making descriptive nominations will not answer questions 1, 2, 3, 6 and 10.

(A) REPORT OF DOMINION OR PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT
OFFICIAL

I consider the settlement arrangements are.....
(Satisfactory or unsatisfactory)

If unsatisfactory, give reasons.....
(If space insufficient, attach report)

Signature.....
Date..... Office.....

(B) I recommend this nomination be.....
(Accepted or not accepted)

District.....
(Dist. Supt. Land Settlement Branch)

Date.....

(C) I——concur.
(do not)

Date..... Superintendent, Land Settlement Branch

(D) DIRECTOR OF EUROPEAN EMIGRATION
APPROVED AND REFERRED FOR NECESSARY ACTION,

Ottawa,.....
(Date) Commissioner of Colonization.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

1928

D.O. File No.....
Imm. File No.....

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION
CANADA

NOMINATION OF A BRITISH HOUSEHOLD WORKER UNDER EMPIRE SETTLEMENT ACT

NOTE:—This form may be used by any British subject resident in Canada. It is for the convenience of those requiring household help who may know of someone in the British Isles likely to be suitable. Those unacquainted in the British Isles, may nominate by description, using this form, but will not answer questions 1 to 5 on this side of the form. In descriptive nominations, the religious faith of the nominator may be stated if it is desired to secure a migrant of the same faith. In the Provinces east of Manitoba two copies must be completed and sent to the Department of Immigration and Colonization, Ottawa. In the Western Provinces three copies must be completed and sent to the District Superintendent, Land Settlement Branch, Department of Immigration and Colonization, at any of the following addresses. Address nearest office.

- Manitoba: Winnipeg, Man., Commercial Bldg.
- British Columbia: Vancouver, B.C., Winch Bldg.; Vernon, B.C., Megaw Bldg.
- Saskatchewan: Regina, Sask., Veteran Bldg.; Saskatoon, Sask., Connaught Bldg.; Prince Albert, Sask., Harphill Bldg.
- Alberta: Edmonton, Alta., Blowey-Henry Block; Calgary, Alta., Southam Bldg.

I, the undersigned, a British Subject, resident in Canada for.....years, do hereby nominate:

1. Name of Migrant.....Age.....Usual Occupation.....
 2. Address in British Isles.....
(Give full post office and street address)
 3. Is she married, single, or a widow?.....
(If married, give husband's occupation and present address)
 4. Is she a relative, acquaintance or intended wife?.....
(If not personally known give name and address of person who recommended her to you)
 5. Has she been in Canada before?....If so, state when she left and for what reason
-I,.....become jointly responsible with the
(will or will not)
- migrant for the repayment to Government of any passage loan the migrant may require.
-
(Signature of Nominator)
-
(Post Office Address) (Date)

PARTICULARS OF EMPLOYER AND SITUATION OFFERED

(To be completed by Employer)

1. Are you married, single, or a widower?.....
2. Give number of rooms in your house.....

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

3. Give below particulars of persons living with you:—

Adults (over 17)	Relationship	Children (under 17) (Numbers only)
		Boys.
		Girls.

4. What will be the Migrant's duties..... Will you take a girl without experience in housework.....
5. Period of Engagement..... Wages offered per month.....
6. Do you usually employ household help?.... State number usually employed by you.....
7. State earliest date help wanted..... Latest date help will be accepted.....

I, the undersigned, a British Subject, resident in Canada for..... years, certify the above answers to be correct. I agree to employ the migrant on the terms stated and to provide proper home conditions.

.....
 (Full Post Office Address of Employer) (Signature of Employer)

 (Occupation of Employer)

(a) Report of Dominion or Provincial Government Official:—

I consider the settlement arrangements.....
 (Satisfactory or unsatisfactory)

(If unsatisfactory give reasons. If insufficient space attach report)

Place
 Date
 Signature
 Office

(b) I recommend this nomination be.....
 (Accepted or not accepted)

District..... Date.....
 (Dist. Supt. Land Settlement Branch)

(c) I..... concur.
 (Do not)
 Date.....
 (Superintendent, Land Settlement Branch)

(d) Director of European Emigration:—
 Approved and referred for necessary action.

Ottawa,.....
 (Date) (Commissioner of Colonization)
 [Mr. W. J. Egan.]

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION CANADA

ASSISTED PASSAGES

FOR

BRITISH SUBJECTS

1928

RATES

To:—

Halifax, St. John or Quebec..	£2. 0
Montreal..	£3. 0
Toronto..	£3.10
Winnipeg..	£4.10
Regina, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon..	£5. 0
Calgary or Edmonton..	£5.10
Vancouver..	£8. 0

Issued by

THE DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION
OTTAWA

(1) *Nominations*

Any British Subject resident in Canada may nominate any British Subject in the British Isles, excepting one resident in the Irish Free State which is not a party to the Agreement.

(2) *How to Nominate*

Nomination forms may be secured from Dominion Immigration and Land Settlement Officers and from Bank Managers. Nomination may be made by name or if the nominator has no suitable person in mind, by description using the regular form but omitting name and similar personal details.

(3) *Passage Rates*

Rates payable by adult migrants are set out on the cover of this pamphlet. The rates quoted are for Third Class Transportation from any Port in Great Britain to the Centres mentioned in the Schedule. Adult migrants are required to pay rail fares from such centres to ultimate destinations. An adult is a person 17 years of age or over.

(4) *Passage Assistance* is available to the following:—

(a) *Families* who will engage in farming or work on the land. Passage assistance takes the form of a free grant of part of the transportation cost for adults and free passage for children under seventeen. When necessary and advisable, the amount payable by the adult may be advanced in whole or in part as a loan, to be repaid in instalments after arrival in Canada.

(b) *Single Men* to be employed as farm labourers. Assistance takes the form of a free grant of part of the cost of transportation. No passage loans are available to single men.

(c) *Household Workers* to be employed in domestic service. Assistance takes the form of a free grant of part of the transportation cost. Every Household Worker must pay £2 towards cost of her passage, but if necessary and advisable, a loan of the balance of the fare may be made, provided that in no case the total loan exceeds £6.

(5) *Repayment of Loans*

Nominators of families or household workers who receive passage loans are jointly responsible with migrants for repayment of loans. Loans to House-

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

hold Workers are repayable in monthly instalments of \$5.00 beginning one month after arrival. Loans to Families are repayable in quarterly instalments beginning three months after arrival and must be completed in one year after first payment is due.

FOR INFORMATION AND ADVICE

APPLY TO

THE DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, OTTAWA

Any Dominion Immigration Official—Any District Superintendent or Field Supervisor, Land Settlement Branch

Land Settlement Branch Offices:—

Maritime Provinces: St. John, N.B.

Quebec: Sherbrooke, P.Q.

Ontario: Toronto, 32 Adelaide street, E.

Manitoba: Winnipeg, Commercial Bldg.

Saskatchewan: Regina, Veteran Bldg.; Saskatoon, Connaught Bldg.; Prince Albert, Harphill Bldg.

Alberta: Edmonton, Blowey-Henry Block; Calgary, Southam Bldg.

British Columbia: Vancouver, Winch Bldg.; Vernon, Megaw Bldg.

I have really prepared this memorandum more for the observation of the members when reading over the minutes of the meeting. I have here memoranda in connection with the procedure in Canada. Shall I read it all?

Agreed to.

This is under date of November 11th, 1927, and reads as follows. (Reading):

Copy/Fr.

OTTAWA, 11th November, 1927.

Memorandum:

PROCEDURE TO BE ADOPTED FOR THE MOVEMENT OF BRITISH IMMIGRANTS UNDER THE ASSISTED PASSAGE SCHEME IN 1928

I. Procedure in Canada.

1. *Departmental placing.*—Instead of fixing Departmental quotas as last year, for experienced, partly experienced and inexperienced farm workers, the Department will assume responsibility for the placement of all the experienced farm workers and houseworkers that can be secured and of the inexperienced farm workers and houseworkers that may be nominated.

2. *Nominations.*—In view of the importance of this branch of the work, every effort will be made to increase nominations both personal and descriptive. The Department will give publicity to the scheme so that British subjects in Canada will be encouraged to nominate.

Nominations will include agricultural families, single farm labourers and houseworkers. The Department will not insist on the person nominated having had any particular experience in the occupation they are to follow in Canada provided their general fitness in other directions is satisfactory.

Nomination will include agricultural families, single farm labourers Division Immigration Commissioners at Winnipeg and Vancouver, from District Superintendents and Supervisors of the Land Settlement Branch, from chartered banks, from any official of the Colonization Depart-

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

ments of the C.N.R. and C.P.R., from any Immigration organization operating under the auspices of religious bodies and from certain Provincial Government representatives who will be named later.

In order to remove any cause for delay in handling these nominations, the papers when completed should be forwarded to the nearest District Superintendent or Field Supervisor of the Land Settlement Branch or to any Provincial Government official who may be named later.

Nomination of houseworkers destined to points west of Ontario should be sent to the nearest District Superintendent or Field Supervisor of the Land Settlement Branch and those destined to points east of the Manitoba Boundary should be forwarded to the Supervisor, Women's Branch of the Department at Ottawa. Nominations, whether for farm workers or houseworkers arising in the Eastern Townships of Quebec, may be sent either to the Land Settlement Branch or to the Eastern Townships Immigration Society, Sherbrooke, Que.

Nomination papers will be examined immediately and if approved will be forwarded by first mail to the Director of Emigration for Canada in London. All those interested in promoting immigration are invited to co-operate in encouraging employers in Canada to complete nomination papers if they wish to secure British farm workers or houseworkers, experienced or inexperienced.

The Department urges the widespread development of the nomination system with its offer of satisfactory placement and yearly employment, in preference to bulk nomination which experience shows results in a small percentage of satisfactory settlement and in adverse criticism, both of which tend to impair immigration effort in the British Isles.

3. *Bulk Nomination.*—In order to meet any demand for farm labour which may not be taken care of by Departmental placing and nominations described above, immigration and colonization organizations including those operating under the auspices of religious bodies, are invited to place in the hands of any District Superintendent of the Land Settlement Branch, information as to the number of experienced or inexperienced farm workers they think they can place in that district. The District Superintendent if satisfied that the demand exists will wire the Department and authority will be immediately cabled to London for whatever movement is approved. In this way delays will be eliminated and group movements can be increased or reduced from month to month as the circumstances require.

Sailings under bulk nomination will end on the 15th of May, unless it is shown there is a demand which is not then being met by Departmental placings and nominations.*

4. *Provincial Governments.*—The Department will continue to co-operate with any Province desirous of assisting in the selection overseas or in the placement in Canada of families, single men or houseworkers, experienced or inexperienced.

5. The Department will continue to co-operate with all the Societies and organizations engaged in promoting juvenile immigration, including lads under seventeen, for farm placement.

II. *Procedure in the British Isles.*

1. Efforts will be made in every legitimate way to increase the flow of British migrants under the Empire Settlement Scheme. All other interests are invited to co-operate in recruiting suitable persons. With the establishment of the Canadian medical inspection which will come into effect shortly after the New Year, the regulation calling for a Sailing Permit for unaccompanied women will be abolished.

* Sailings under Bulk Nomination will continue until June 15th.

2. While co-operation in recruiting will be welcomed from every source, control of selection of all those receiving Empire Settlement assistance will be in the hands of the Department. The necessary additions to the Departmental staff of interviewers will be made so that there will be no undue delay in conducting interviews.

WITNESS: I have here a letter written to our Director in connection with the same thing. Shall I read this, or will it be accepted as read?

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Committee accept it as read?

Agreed to.

WITNESS: This is a letter to our Director, covering the details of this last memorandum which I have read, in connection with Empire Settlement. It will be printed in the record so that you gentlemen will have it before you when you come to consider your judgment. (Reading):

Copy/FR.

17th November, 1927.

DEAR Mr. WALKER,—You were advised by cable under date of the 11th instant regarding Empire Settlement nominations for 1928. We have also received your cable asking for a definite limitation of numbers for bulk nomination.

If you will refer to our cable of the above date you will notice that the Department is prepared to accept responsibility for the placement not of a limited number, but of all experienced farm workers and house-workers who can be secured and of such inexperienced migrants as may be nominated by residents of Canada. You will also notice by the above cable that the Department will allow bulk nomination* for sailings up to the 15th May next by Immigration and Colonization organizations who establish the demand and ability to place experienced or inexperienced farm workers. There is no bulk nomination for domestics.

Direct and Descriptive Nominations.—Under this category you will receive nominations of married farm labourers and their families, single farm labourers and household workers.

Under this heading the Department will determine whether the settlement arrangements are satisfactory and you will be advised to that effect. Last year, as you are aware, there were unnecessary delays both on this side and overseas by the Department and by other Immigration and Colonization organizations. It has, therefore, been decided that as soon as settlement arrangements have been determined and the nomination is accepted by the Department, the form of nomination will be transmitted to you for completion. There will be no covering letter. The nomination will simply be by concise instructions which will be applicable to every case. It will be necessary for you to determine whether the nominee is a suitable migrant and is likely to accept and remain at farm employment. In the case of a direct nomination it will also be necessary for you to determine whether the nominee has the qualifications required by the nominator as set out in the nomination form. It will also be necessary to exercise great care in completing descriptive nominations, i.e., to select a person having the qualifications required by the nominator.

Bulk Nomination.—You submitted a memorandum under date of the 18th of August last in which you denounced the Railways' Quota system and gave evidence in support of your statement that the quota system had been anything but satisfactory both with respect to quality and [Mr. W. J. Egan.]

quantity. It was, therefore, decided to discontinue the quota system en bloc as established last year. The procedure will now be as follows:—

In order to meet any demand for farm labour which may not be taken care of by direct and descriptive nomination and other placement under the auspices of the Department, Immigration and Colonization organizations, including those operating under the auspices of religious bodies, have been invited to place in the hands of District Superintendents of the Land Settlement Branch information as to the number of experienced or inexperienced farm workers they think can be satisfactorily placed in each district. The District Superintendent, having regard to his knowledge of local requirements, will at once advise the Department and you will be instructed by cable. By this method delays will be eliminated and group movements can be increased or reduced from month to month as the circumstances require without interfering with general recruiting.

Provincial Governments.—The Department will continue to co-operate with any Provincial Government, the officials of which desire to assist in selection or in placement of families, single men or houseworkers, experienced or inexperienced.

Selection.—You stated in your memorandum of the 18th August last that it was a mistake to substitute for trained officers of the Department traffic canvassers of the Canadian Railways. It has, therefore, been decided that the Oversea officials of the Department shall control selection. A number of trained officials will sail about the middle of December and a second party will leave so that they may arrive at as early a date as possible in January, 1928, for the purpose of assisting in interviewing and selection until the 1st of April.

Procedure.—The Information Form must be transmitted, as formerly, in duplicate to the Department. The result of the interview must be written on the back of the form. You have already been advised that we cannot accept stereotype endorsements such as the C.P.R. submitted in the case of the Salvation Army migrants from Hadleigh. This is regarded as worthless and a mere waste of time. The interview should show in brief form the industrial record, adaptability of the migrant and a statement of character as disclosed by the confidential reference. This procedure is to be adopted in the case of families or farm labourers, experienced or inexperienced, who are interviewed or accepted by our officers. You will continue to send, as at present, the Information Form of all those interviewed and selected by agents of Provincial Governments, who should also be asked to endorse similar information on the back of the form. You will continue to use the prospect Form for household workers.

Co-operation by Booking Agents.—It will be left to the discretion of any of our regular Agents in the United Kingdom to accept the interview of a thoroughly reliable booking agent, but our agent will be held responsible for selection on the submission of a booking agent. This is not a new procedure because if you will refer to Circular No. 40 of the 4th September, 1925, you will notice that a similar latitude was given at that time. In determining whether the interview of a thoroughly reliable booking agent should be accepted our agent should be guided by:—

- (a) The particulars on the Information Form;
- (b) The source and character of the references;
- (c) The ability and reliability of the booking agent who submits the case;
- (d) The medical certificate.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

You will notice it was set out that the booking agent could render valuable co-operation in determining character, physique, industry, adaptability and experience. It must be left, however, entirely to the judgment of our agent to determine whether or not any special submission by a thoroughly reliable booking agent should be accepted or whether a further interview should be made. An interview under such circumstances must be signed by the booking agent and endorsed by our agent, because a thorough record will be kept in the department of the result of all Empire Settlement work. You will be advised at an early date of the survey which has already been made of the nomination work of last year. Every Information Form must show the origin of the business. It is imperative that this information be shown, otherwise it will involve correspondence in every case between the department and your office.

Yours very truly,

J. BRUCE WALKER, Esq.,
 Director of Emigration,
 The Canadian Building,
 Trafalgar Square,
 London, S.W. 1,
 England.

* Sailings under bulk nomination will continue until June 15th.

WITNESS: I have a memorandum here which I think will be interesting to the Committee even now. It is in regard to Administrative procedure. (Reading).

Administrative Procedure

The following is the procedure regarding applicants under the 3,000 Family Scheme:—

The form of application gives the names and addresses of at least two references. If the information on the application form indicates a good prospect the agent at once advises the applicant that the references are being taken up. Occasionally persons who are given as references do not reply and this necessitates considerable delay.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You know better than the Committee whether it is important for us to know; it is more a matter of procedure than of policy.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I think any one interested in the evidence will look this up and read it.

Mr. DONNELLY: Could you not have it filed, and printed in the record, then if we have any questions to ask, we will have it before us.

WITNESS: I can do that.

Mr. DONNELLY: I cannot follow you at all.

WITNESS: Am I reading it too fast?

Mr. DONNELLY: If you will just file it and have it printed in the record, it will save time.

The CHAIRMAN: It can be filed and printed in the record.

WITNESS: It is headed "Administrative Procedure."

As soon as a reply is received from the references the Immigration Agent at once fixes a date and time to interview the applicant who can change the date and time if unsuitable. The applicant is interviewed and the result of the interview is endorsed on the form of application which is submitted to our London office for the approval of the Oversea Settlement Department of the British Government. Under the Roster doctor system, [Mr. W. J. Egan.]

as soon as the case was approved, the applicant was advised and was urged to arrange for medical inspection so that the case could be completed. In many cases applicants delayed medical inspection for weeks and, consequently, were themselves responsible for the delays which occurred. Under the new system of inspection arrangements are made, where possible, to have the medical inspection at the time of the interview by the agent so that the whole case is completed much quicker than under the Roster doctor inspection.

Considerable evidence has been given to show the difficulty in obtaining a reference from the present employer of a migrant. Question "21" of the Information Form (which is the form of application for a migrant) reads as follows:—

21. Give names and addresses of two farmers for whom you have worked, and how long with each. If you have not been employed on a farm state so, and give names and addresses of your last employers.

You will notice that the applicant is not requested to give the name of his present employer. References have been required ever since the date of the first Assisted Passage Agreement because moneys are being loaned by the Department and the British Government and since the Reduced Passage Rate moneys are being contributed by both Governments on account of the transportation of the migrant.

References are required in the case of families under the 3,000 Family Settlement Scheme because families are being settled on vacant Soldier Settlement farms which are sold to the settler by the Soldiers Settlement Board and the British Government advances \$1,500 for stock and equipment. The object of the reference is to determine the applicant's character and industrial record which constitute the only security available on the part of the settler for the sale of the farm and for the moneys advanced by the British Government on account of stock and equipment.

The Supervisor of the Women's Division states that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to satisfactorily place household workers who are not in possession of references.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Again that is assisted passage?—A. Yes.

Q. I understand the 3,000 Family quota has been filled?—A. We hope it will be completed this year. So many people have made statements; for instance, we have the provincial scheme coming on, and this shows the policy of the Government.

Q. Unless something new is adopted by Parliament, the 3,000 Family Scheme is through?—A. Yes, but we are working on a New Brunswick and a Federal Scheme, and we are making progress along that line.

I have here a memorandum headed "Juvenile Immigration", which contains a full list of societies working in co-operation with us, with some statistics as to arrivals, and the number each society has handled from as far back as 1868 in some cases. Shall I read it?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: File it.

Document filed.

JUVENILE IMMIGRATION

Juvenile Immigration—that is, the immigration of boys and girls unaccompanied by parents or guardians—is a phase of immigration work so important that it has long been assigned to a special branch of the Department under a supervisor of Juvenile Immigration with headquarters at Ottawa. The Juvenile Immigration Branch works in the closest co-operation with the voluntary Associations under whose auspices the children come to Canada from the

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

British Isles. All these Associations maintain Training Homes in the British Isles and Reception Homes in Canada. Before leaving these Homes the children are carefully inspected by Canadian officials to determine their fitness for Canada. From the Canadian Homes they are placed in selected farm homes. To these Receiving Homes they may return in case of change of employment, illness, or for other reasons. Since the commencement of the movement over 85,000 boys and girls have come to Canada, a great many of whom have become prominent and successful citizens of the Dominion. The large majority are engaged in agricultural pursuits.

Every boy and girl is subjected to medical examination before migration is permitted. Employers in Canada are selected with a view to giving the child a good home and opportunity to acquire a useful training. The Department has a staff of experienced men and women exclusively for the supervision and inspection of these young migrants and the homes in which they are placed in Canada.

The importance and value of the juvenile immigration movement are fully appreciated by the Department which has been and is working to increase this movement along practical lines to conform with new conditions.

CHILDREN MIGRATING UNDER THE AUSPICES OF VOLUNTARY SOCIETIES

For children who migrate under the auspices of Voluntary Societies, assistance is given at the rate of \$80 per head towards the cost of transportation, etc. of children (male and female). This assistance is given in respect of children who reach their fourteenth birthday prior to sailing and who had not reached their seventeenth birthday before the first day of April in the financial year in which they sail, provided that in exceptional cases, assistance may be given to children who had not reached their fourteenth birthday prior to sailing.

The Voluntary Society is paid \$80, or £16.9.9 per head for those who are destined to points east of Manitoba. The ocean fare is £11.10.0, or \$44.97, for a child who migrates under the auspices of a Voluntary Society. This leaves a margin to the Voluntary Society of £4.10, or \$21.90, per child which is retained by the Voluntary Society for railroad fare and other administrative expenses. In other words, for every one hundred children, the Voluntary Society receives the sum of £450 or approximately \$2,250, for railroad fare and administrative expenses.

STATEMENT SHOWING THE TOTAL ARRIVALS OF PARTIES OF CHILDREN BROUGHT TO CANADA BY JUVENILE SOCIETIES DURING THE YEAR WHICH ENDED MARCH 31, 1927.

Dr. Barnardo's Homes, Toronto.....	(Boys)	121
	(Girls)	6
Mr. J. W. C. Fegan, Toronto.....		36
National Children's Home and Orphanage, Hamilton.....	(Boys)	65
	(Girls)	2
Catholic Emigration Association.....	(Boys)	172
	(Girls)	28
Church of England Society, Sherbrooke, P.Q.....	(Boys)	63
Church of England Society, Toronto.....	(Girls)	...
Fairknowe Home (Mr. Quarrier's), Brockville.....	(Boys)	34
	(Girls)	13
The Salvation Army, Montreal, P.Q.....	(Boys)	256
	(Girls)	45
Sir J. T. Middlemore, Fairview Station, Halifax, N.S.....	(Boys)	3
	(Girls)	5
Cossar Training Farm, Lower Gagetown, N.B.....		83
Dakeyne Farm, Windsor, N.S.....		9
British Immigration and Colonization Association, Montreal.....		489
The Church Army, Winnipeg, Manitoba.....	(Boys)	129
	(Girls)	4
The Church of England Council of Empire Settlement, Edmonton, Alberta.....		19
The Armenian Relief Fund, Toronto.....		8
Unaccompanied.....	(Boys)	73
	(Girls)	78
Total.....		1,741

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

TABLE showing the juvenile immigration during a period of five years:

Fiscal year	Number immigrated
1920-21.....	1,426
1921-22.....	1,211
1922-23.....	1,184
1923-24.....	2,080
1924-25.....	2,000
1925-26.....	1,862
1926-27.....	1,741

CONDENSED statistical history of the Juvenile Immigration Movement since the year 1868

Society or Agency	Year	Number of children sent to Canada
Miss Macpherson and Mrs. Birt, London, Liverpool (Canadian Headquarters, Marchmont Home, Belleville, Ont.).....	1868 to 1926	14,578
Miss Rye and Church of England (Niagara-on-the-Lake and Sherbrooke, P.Q.).....	1868 to 1927	4,142
Mr. (now) Sir J. T. Middlemore, Fairview, Halifax, N.S.....	1873 to 1927	5,097
The National Children's Home and Orphanage (formerly Dr. T. Bowman Stephenson), Hamilton, Ont.....	1873 to 1927	3,172
Mrs. Bilbrough-Wallace (Marchmont Home, Belleville, Ont.).....	1878 to 1915	5,529
Cardinal Manning (Ottawa and Montreal).....	1880 to 1888	1,403
Dr. Barnardo, Toronto, Ont., and Winnipeg, Man.....	1882 to 1927	26,682
Mr. J. W. C. Fegan, Toronto, Ont.....	1884 to 1927	3,036
Mr. Wm. Quarrier, Brockville, Ont.....	1890 to 1927	4,274
The Catholic Emigration Association and amalgamated societies, St. George's Home, Ottawa, Ont.....	1897 to 1927	6,999
The Salvation Army.....	1905 to 1927	3,046
Dr. Cossar, Lower Gagetown, N.B.....	1910 to 1927	646
Captain Oliver Hind, The Dakeyne Farm, Falmouth (near Windsor, N.S.)..	1913 to 1927	91
British Immigration Aid and Colonization Association, Montreal, P.Q.....	1923 to 1927	958
The Church Army, Winnipeg, Man.....	1925 to 1927	279
Church of England Society, Council of Empire Settlement, Edmonton, Alta.	1927	19
Minor Agencies.....	1897 to 1927	5,678
Total.....		85,629

Church of England Council of Empire Settlement.—The Church of England Council, in co-operation with the Council for Social Service of the Church of England in Canada, has established Hostels in Alberta and Saskatchewan for the reception of Church of England boys aged 14 to 17 years. The boys travel from the port of embarkation in the United Kingdom to the Hostel free of cost, and under proper supervision. They are then placed in employment with farmers approved by the superintendent of the Hostel, at the standard wage of the district plus board and lodging. The Council for Social Service helps and advises the boys and guards their welfare during their first years in Canada.

Church Army.—The Church Army also have established a training farm (at Hempstead, Essex) where boys between 14 and 20 years of age who wish to farm in the Dominions are given up to three months' free training in general farm work, with maintenance. Those who go to Canada, and who are approved by the Canadian Government Immigration Authorities, travel at the special passage rates shown on page 5 to the Church Army's reception hostel at Winnipeg, Manitoba. They are then placed in employment with farmers chosen by officers of the Church Army, who are responsible for the boys' welfare for at least three years after arrival in Canada.

Catholic Emigration Association.—This Association undertakes the migration and settlement of Catholic boys and girls of 14 to 17 years of age. A reception hostel (St. George's Home) has been established in Ottawa, to which the young settlers proceed from the United Kingdom under the care of an agent appointed by the Association, and from which they are placed in employment

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

with Catholic families approved by the Parish Priest. A reasonable amount of pocket money is allowed to each child and the balance of their wages is banked by the Association and repaid to them when they are 21 years of age. The Association is responsible for the welfare of the children until they reach the age of 18 years.

Salvation Army Training Farm.—Boys aged 14 to 20 years can be trained in elementary farming, carpentry, etc., at the Salvation Army training farm at Hadleigh, Essex. The course extends from six to twelve weeks, and both training and maintenance are given free of cost. During the voyage and after arrival in Canada the boys are under the care of Salvation Army officers, who place them in employment with selected farmers and to whom they can turn for help and advice during their first three years in Canada.

WITNESS: I have an interesting document here. It is in the shape of an Order-in-Council, dated May 29th, 1920, providing for assistance to juvenile societies prior to the date of the assisted passage agreement, with subsequent orders-in-council.

ORDER IN COUNCIL DATED 29TH MAY, 1920, PROVIDING FOR ASSISTANCE TO JUVENILE SOCIETIES PRIOR TO THE DATE OF THE ASSISTED PASSAGE AGREEMENT WITH SUBSEQUENT ORDERS IN COUNCIL RENEWING THIS ASSISTANCE TO END OF FISCAL YEAR 1922-23 (SALVATION ARMY ON ACCOUNT OF LARGE GENERAL GRANT DID NOT GET THIS ASSISTANCE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1922-23).

P.C. 1190

PRIVY COUNCIL—CANADA

CERTIFIED Copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 29th May, 1920.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated May 20th, 1920, from the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, submitting that for many years the Department of Immigration and Colonization has encouraged a movement of juvenile immigrants from the United Kingdom to Canada, the net result of which has been of great value to the Dominion. This movement is undertaken by various philanthropic societies and organizations of the United Kingdom, which also maintain Receiving and Distributing Offices and Homes in various parts of Canada.

The Minister observes, as an indication of the extent to which this movement has grown, that during the past seventeen years the total immigration of this class has amounted to, approximately, thirty-four thousand boys and girls. The children are transferred in parties from training centres in the United Kingdom to Canadian Receiving and Distributing Homes, through which they are placed in selected situations. The course of training prior to emigration is intended to fit boys and girls for farm work and domestic service. In very few cases are boys placed otherwise than in farm homes, the girls being placed, either in farm homes or in the smaller centres of population.

These juvenile immigrants belong (so far as concerns care and training in the United Kingdom) to two classes,—

- (a) Poor Law Children, who are a charge upon the Local Government Board, and
- (b) Children whose care, training and maintenance have been undertaken by philanthropic societies.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Both these classes are emigrated to Canada by the same societies and, during the past two decades, the Government has, by an arrangement with the Imperial Government, carried on an annual inspection in their Canadian homes of children belonging to class (a) the cost of such annual inspection being borne largely by the Imperial Government. The societies are required to maintain receiving and distributing centres in Canada and also to provide for a regular inspection of their wards.

Recent enquiries indicate that, as a result of conditions largely growing out of the war, there are many thousands of most desirable boys and girls in the United Kingdom who might be secured for Canada and whose immigration would be of great advantage to this country.

The Minister, after careful consideration of the history of this movement and the results of federal inspection of juvenile immigrants, is of opinion that the system of Federal oversight and inspection should be extended to all juvenile immigrants from the date of their arrival in Canada until they attain the age of eighteen years, or such further period as may be considered necessary. Only by maintaining oversight and inspection can the Federal Government,—

- (a) Offer that protection which is due these orphan children.
- (b) Detect those who, within the first few years after arrival, show their unfitness to become permanent residents of Canada, and
- (c) Assure philanthropic societies and individuals in the United Kingdom interested in this movement, that every reasonable safeguard is taken to insure the success of those for whose immigration to Canada they have contributed so generously.

The Minister further observes that the cost to philanthropic societies and organizations for maintenance of Receiving and Distributing Offices and Homes has entailed a greatly enlarged expenditure, which burden is further increased by recent advances in transportation both by land and water. For a number of years a bonus of Two Dollars *per capita* has been paid to these Receiving and Distributing Homes on all approved juvenile immigrants. The Minister is of opinion that the time has arrived when, in the interests of this movement, some further assistance should be granted to these Homes and Agencies.

The Minister, therefore, recommends that the bonus be discontinued and a grant be made, for the present fiscal year, to such Receiving and Distributing Homes or Agencies as bring to Canada within the fiscal year, one hundred or more juvenile immigrants (no grant to be paid to Homes or Agencies which bring to Canada less than one hundred juvenile immigrants); the grant to be one thousand dollars, on the basis of the first hundred juvenile immigrants, and an additional grant of Five Hundred Dollars for each additional hundred, or fraction thereof (providing such fraction is fifty or more); these sums to be paid out of the Vote for Immigration Contingencies.

The Committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

(Signed) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

GRANT

A grant of \$1,000 is made by the Department to each Home immigrating 100 children and an additional grant of \$500 for each additional 100 or fraction thereof, if the fraction is over 50.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

The following table shows how the grant is computed:—

Children	
100..	\$1,000
151..	1,500
201..	1,500
251..	2,000
301..	2,000
351..	2,500
401..	2,500
451..	3,000
501..	3,000
555..	3,500
601..	3,500
651..	4,000
701..	4,000
751..	4,500
801..	4,500
851..	5,000
901..	5,000
951..	5,500
1001..	5,500

Copy

P.C. 2276

CERTIFIED copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Deputy Governor General on the 27th June, 1921.

The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, advise that a grant be made for the present fiscal year to Receiving and Distributing Homes or Agencies bringing juvenile immigrants to Canada, on the same basis as was authorized for similar purposes by the Order in Council (P.C. 1190) of the 29th May, 1920.

(Signed) G. G. KEZAR,

Asst. Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable

The Minister of Immigration and Colonization.

Copy

File 3115

OTTAWA, 5th May, 1922.

The Secretary
Immigration and Colonization
Memorandum.

Mr. Black

From year to year the Salvation Army receives a grant for their general work. Last year they were paid a total of \$25,000 authorized by P.C. 2693 Aug. 1, 1921, and P.C. 4493, Dec. 1, 1921. I have marked these two orders in council on file 17480 in case you wish to get the exact wording of them.

For the last two years the receiving and distributing Homes for juvenile immigrants have been assisted by a form of grant, the amount of which is governed by the number of immigrants they bring. The first order in council passed in this matter was 1190, May 29, 1920, copy of which is immediately underneath, and this has been renewed from year to year. Under this arrangement the Salvation Army were paid for the fiscal year 1920-1921 the sum of \$1,500, and if we deal with them on the same basis for 1921-1922 they will receive a further \$1,500.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

This means that in addition to the \$25,000 covering their general work for 1921-1922 they received \$1,500 more for one particular department of the work. This does not seem quite right to me and for that reason I am calling your attention to it. Under the terms of the orders in council above mentioned they may be legally entitled to it, but even this is doubtful. The question I would like decided, however, is whether the Department wishes to continue paying both grants.

(Signed) A. R. MORISSET,
Accountant.

File—3115

OTTAWA, May 17th, 1922.

The Secretary
Immigration and Colonization.

Memorandum.

Mr. Smart

Please note the decision given on our memorandum of the 5th instant, regarding the grant or grants to the Salvation Army. I was phoning Mr. Featherston this morning as to whether the grant for Juveniles should be paid for the last fiscal year 1921-22. In view of P.C. 2276 the Department may be under obligation to pay for last year and we are, therefore, putting through the payment of \$1,500. When preparing the memorandum to Council to cover the Juvenile grants for this year, I presume you will exclude the Salvation Army participating.

Sgd. G. F. WORDEN,
Asst. Accountant.

P.C. 2078

CERTIFIED copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy The Deputy of Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 6th October, 1922.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a Report, dated 1st August, 1922, from the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization, submitting that by Order in Council of the 29th May, 1920 (P.C. 1190, copy attached), authority was given for certain grants to Receiving and Distributing Homes or Agencies bringing juvenile immigrants to Canada.

The Minister recommends that the same privilege or arrangement be extended for the fiscal year 1922-23 to all Receiving and Distributing Homes or Agencies bringing juvenile immigrants to Canada, with the exception of the Salvation Army, who are receiving Government assistance for their general immigration work.

The Committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

Sgd. G. G. KEZAR,
Asst. Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable
The Minister of Immigration and Colonization.

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. Mr. Egan, have you filed any memorandum which shows the grants paid to provinces, societies and such like for immigration?—A. It seems to me that somebody did ask that question. I cannot think of it for the moment.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You further mentioned that you had in that list all the voluntary societies engaged in the work?—A. Yes.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. How many are there?—A. Fifteen.

Q. Are there any to whom you make a grant, that is to say, a bulk grant, excepting the Salvation Army?—A. Not in those children's societies.

Q. The Salvation Army is the only one?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. What about the British Emigration and Colonization Society?—A. There is no grant to them, except what they all secure.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. I spoke of a bulk grant, and I was then coming along to this: What is the assistance given in which these societies benefit; is that the \$80 grant?—A. Yes.

Q. You pay a grant of \$80, as I understand it, towards the transportation and general expenses, and their actual cost of transportation is something like \$56.?—A. Yes.

Q. So that they get the benefit of \$24.?—A. Yes. Previous to this they paid the fares of all children themselves. That is why I have brought this grant before you.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. You paid that, you gave that before, for the Salvation Army?—A. Yes, before the assisted passages came into force, towards their general work, and we continued to pay it. I shall be glad to make a statement later on in regard to that.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. There were a lot of grants made to these different societies, but the only bulk grant for juvenile work is to the Salvation Army, besides their other work?—A. Yes.

Q. But others, and the Army too, are only assisted by way of a contribution of \$80. towards the transportation and expenses of each individual?—A. That is all.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Some of the organizations get a larger grant?—A. No, sir.

Q. What about the Clan Donald?—A. That is not children. I am speaking of children only, juveniles only.

HON. MR. EDWARDS: There was a question as to what grants were made.

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. I thought that information would be useful to the sub-Committee to know what money was paid by the Department to various organizations or to provinces. That is information I thought would be useful?—A. How far do you want me to go with that?

Q. We had better finish up with what you are on?—A. I might point out, Mr. Ralston, if I may, that you will have some idea of the subscriptions to the societies before the grant was given. There was a grant before we gave this contribution of \$80 outright, which came in under the Empire Settlement.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. There was no grant under one hundred?—A. I do not remember. It is some time since I read it. This says:

A grant of \$1,000. is made by the Department to each Home immigrating 100 children, and an additional grant of \$500 for each additional 100 or fraction thereof, if the fraction is over 50.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. It is all over now?—A. Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. Have you anything more, Mr. Egan?—A. I have a lot more, sir. The next proposition I have for the consideration of your Committee is our Women's Division.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. I think it will be well for us to know just what you have.—A. I propose submitting to you information in regard to our Women's Division, our Publicity, and some facts in connection with certain evidence given re "How Australia Handles its people" with references, etc., from their own Blue Books; answers to several of the witnesses in connection with material that they submitted, such as Mr. Corbett, executive of the Society in Montreal; Canon Burd, instanced one individual. I also have a memorandum here in reference to part of the evidence of Mr. Beatty; something in connection with Mr. MacAlister, and in connection with Canon Vernon. I have prepared a statement for submission of my own—whether you want it or not I do not know—in reference to foreign born, and I want to submit to you something in connection with Canon Vernon's statement in reference to the 3,000 family scheme. I also want to submit some facts in reference to that, and some facts in reference to the Salvation Army, and in connection with which we did try a year ago to give certain institutions the right of selection of people rather than actually within the Government, and our reasons for not continuing it, because it has not worked out to advantage. That covers about all I have to submit.

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. You do not know whether the information asked for has been given?—A. I am not just clear upon that. All of them are assisted on the passage money. Do you want that indicated?

Q. What I have in mind is, I would like to know how much money has been paid by Department of Immigration to each and every society, or province that has had anything to do with bringing in immigrants.—A. The contributions towards their work, not so much our assisted passage work?

Q. You have them separately?—A. We have them separately.

Q. Possibly you can give them separately?—A. Yes.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: The assisted passage is what he has dealt with, namely, showing that the immigrant used to get two pounds, and it is now three pounds.

WITNESS: It was just the reverse. There was first the loans, then we inaugurated the £3, and it is now £2.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: A contribution by the Federal Department to anybody brought in by these societies, stands, it is just the same. The other thing, in connection with juveniles, is granted to organizations or provinces in a lump sum.

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. It was more in reference to grants of lump sums?—A. To what date do you want me to go back?

Q. I do not know that that one year will serve much purpose; I have in mind that I wanted to get an idea of how much money was expended by the Department in this way.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Subsidizing?

WITNESS: We can boil that down to a few things.

Mr. GLEN: Is there any that we can file without having them read?

The CHAIRMAN: We can take that up this afternoon.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. When a man is coming out here under an assisted passage, does he designate the point to which he is coming, on the other side, or is that done at the port of entry?—A. If he is nominated by a relative he knows where he is going.

Q. But suppose he said he was going to Toronto; the assisted passage would cover it to that point; he drops off there, and he then asks for further assistance in order to go farther west?—A. No.

Q. There is nothing like that?—A. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: The sub-Committee will meet at 9 o'clock to-night, and this Committee will meet at 4 o'clock this afternoon.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until 4 p.m.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston.

Q. You do not know whether the information asked for has been given?

A. I am not just clear upon that. All of them are detailed on the passage money. Do you want that indicated?

Q. What I have in mind is, I would like to know how much money has been paid by Department of Immigration to each and every society, or province that has had anything to do with bringing in immigrants—A. The contributions towards their work, not so much our assisted passage work.

Q. You have them separately?—A. We have them separately.

Q. Possibly you can give them separately?—A. Yes.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON. The assisted passage is what he has dealt with, namely, showing that the immigrant need to get two pounds, and is now three pounds.

Witness: It was just the reverse. There was what the Government was

requested the £3, and it is now £2.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON. A contribution by the Federal Department to any body, through any of these societies, stands it is just the same. The other thing, in connection with juveniles, is granted to organizations or provinces in a lump sum.

Q. —no are you talk up being settled and so on?

Mr. RALSTON. I am not sure what you mean. I am not sure what you mean.

Q. I do not know that that one year will serve much purpose; I have in mind that I wanted to get an idea of how much money was expended by the

Hon. Mr. RALSTON. Subsidizing?

Witness: We can pull that down to a few things, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN: We can take that up this afternoon, or we can take it up

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Committee resumed at 4 p.m.

W. J. Egan recalled.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have here a review of the Department's position in reference to the Salvation Army. I have covered some of the statements given in evidence. It is an explanation all the way through of the Department's stand and part of the correspondence to bring about a clear understanding for the members of the Committee, the whole purpose of course being to explain that while we are now working in co-operation and on clear-cut lines with the Salvation Army it is just as well to clear up, from a departmental point of view, the evidence we have. Shall I submit it or read it?

The CHAIRMAN: I think it should be tabled.

Several MEMBERS: Take it as read.

SALVATION ARMY

I quote the following extracts from the evidence of Colonel Thos. R. Tudge of the Salvation Army on page 477 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization respecting an Order of Reference—Immigration Inquiry (No. 17—Wednesday May 9, 1928—Thursday, May 10, 1928).

I am here to-day at the invitation of this Committee, I understand, to make a statement in regard to the work of the Salvation Army Migration and Settlement Department, especially relating to that of Canadian Settlement.....

The Salvation Army Migration and Settlement Department came into being in 1903 as the result of many calls for help and assistance received in Great Britain from people who desired to migrate..... and on page 482:—

.....In addition to these Territorial Divisions the Migration and Settlement Department (Chief Office, Montreal) is represented by a Resident Secretary with suitable assistants. The Resident Secretary, whose sole business is Immigration and Settlement, is responsible for the Immigration and Settlement work throughout the whole of the Dominion and while closely co-operating with the Territorial Commissioners is responsible directly to Migration House in London.....

I quote the following extract from the evidence of Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw of the Salvation Army which appears on page 503:—

Q. Do you keep your accounts in this connection separate? Is there a line clearly drawn between the money received and spent for immigration and the money received and spent for other purposes?

A. Absolutely. The Salvation Army acts under two separate deed polls, one for the general organization, which is the religious side and then there is the social side which is operated under what is known as "the Darkest England Trust". The accounts are entirely separate and published balance sheets are supplied each year. The central fund's balance

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

sheet, which includes the religious side, is issued on the 30th of September and the Darkest England, which embraces the Immigration Department and the other social activities, is issued as from the 31st of March each year.

I desire in the first place to emphasize the fact that the Department has had no dispute with the Salvation Army as a religious and social organization. The difficulties which have arisen are entirely between the Immigration Branch of the Salvation Army and the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

These disputes may be summarized as follows:—

1. Grants of money for carrying on immigration work;
2. The Army's custom of collecting from immigrant boys;
3. The movement of women for domestic service.

1. Grants of Money for Carrying on Immigration Work

With reference to grants of money to the Immigration Branch of the Salvation Army for carrying on immigration work, annexed hereto is a statement of amounts paid by the Department of Immigration and Colonization to the Salvation Army for a period of twenty-three years from the fiscal year of 1904-05.

It will be observed from this Statement that during the period mentioned, i.e., from 1904-05 until 1926-27, the Salvation Army received an annual grant which varied from \$500 plus bonuses amounting to \$9,052.50 in 1906-07 to grants of \$35,000 in 1923-24. It will also be observed from this Statement that the total sums paid to the Salvation Army from April 1, 1904 to March 31, 1927 was \$555,268.91.

The Empire Settlement Act, 1922, was passed on the 31st of May, 1922. The first Assisted Passage Agreement between the Department of Immigration and the Oversea Settlement Department of the British Government was executed on the 11th April, 1923. Under the Assisted Passage Agreement loans were made in whole or in part to immigrants coming to Canada to work on the land and to household workers.

When passage assistance was under discussion the then Acting Minister of Immigration, the Hon. Charles Stewart, took the view that the offer of passage assistance by Canada in conjunction with the British Government would necessitate a revision of the whole policy of making grants to organizations especially as the Assisted Passage Agreement provided not for a loan but for a grant on account of the transportation of children who migrate under the auspices of juvenile societies. Prior to the first Assisted Passage Agreement the transportation of these children to Canada was paid by the Juvenile Migration Societies. Under the various Assisted Passage Agreements which have been in effect since the 11th of April, 1923 the sum of \$80 has been paid jointly by the Department of Immigration and the overseas Settlement Department to Juvenile Societies for the transportation of each juvenile immigrant within the meaning and in accordance with the terms of the Agreement.

The Juvenile Emigration Societies, which of course include the Salvation Army, obtain a rate of £11.10.0 or \$55.96 which leaves a margin of \$24.04 to the Juvenile Migration Society for railroad and other incidental expenses. This means that for every 100 children brought forward to points East of Manitoba by the Immigration Department of the Salvation Army or any other Juvenile Migration Society, the Department pays \$8,000 of which amount the sum of \$5,600 is expended on account of ocean transportation and the balance of \$2,400 is retained by the Juvenile Society for railroad and other incidental expenses.

Under date of the 11th of April, 1927 a supplementary Passage Agreement was executed to provide that in the case of children proceeding to destinations in Canada, West of Ontario, the assistance would be at the rate of \$100.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

The grant was not discontinued to the Immigration Branch of the Salvation Army on the date of the Assisted Passage Agreement because it was claimed some previous promise had been made that the grant of \$25,000 would be given for a period of four years, but some time before the four-year period expired the Army was advised that the grant would not again be renewed inasmuch as the Immigration Branch of the Army and other Juvenile Societies had been relieved of all expenditure on account of ocean transportation.

The above grant of \$25,000 was, therefore, paid annually to the Salvation Army Immigration and Settlement Department for a period of four years commencing with the fiscal year 1923-24 but this grant was discontinued on account of the Assisted Passage Agreement. During the four-year period mentioned, the Salvation Army Immigration and Settlement Department, therefore, not only received \$25,000 per annum or grants totalling \$100,000 but also grants on account of transportation for juveniles amounting to \$106,748.87 of which amount the sum of \$45,220.19 was paid by the Oversea Settlement Department. Apart altogether, however, from the sums paid by the Department to the Salvation Army Immigration and Settlement Department on account of transportation, it would have been necessary to reconsider the whole policy of giving grants. In the first place the Immigration and Settlement Department of the Salvation Army is a booking agency and very strong representations had been made by Booking Agents in the United Kingdom who vigorously protested against the Salvation Army receiving preferential treatment in the form of cash subsidies. There are in the United Kingdom several thousand Booking Agents who do much of the spade work in recruiting immigrants and the Department is not prepared to incur the hostility of the individual Booking Agent in the British Isles. In the second place several Provincial Governments were making grants to the Salvation Army, the result being that the Immigration and Settlement Department of the Salvation Army were placing their immigrants largely if not wholly in those Provinces from which they obtain financial assistance.

The Immigration and Settlement Department of the Salvation Army now receive:—

- (a) A grant of \$5,000;
- (b) A grant of \$10 per boy for training at Hadleigh;
- (c) A per diem allowance for household workers in Salvation Army Hostels. (We have not yet been advised as to whether the Salvation Army will accept this contribution.)
- (d) A joint grant of \$80 for the transportation of each juvenile migrant whose destination is east of Manitoba and \$100 when the destination is west of Ontario. Of this grant the Salvation Army or any other juvenile migration society receives a margin of \$24.04 per migrant for railroad and other incidental expenses;
- (e) The benefit of the reduced ocean rate given under the Assisted Passage Agreement to every adult migrant approved by Oversea Agents of the Department.

Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) are contributions by the Dominion Government; paragraph (d) is a joint contribution on a fifty-fifty basis by the British and Dominion Governments.

2. *The Army's Custom of Collecting from Immigrant Boys*

The movement of juvenile immigrants to Canada under the auspices of various organizations has been going on for something like sixty years. The Army became interested in this work in 1905 and out of the total of upwards of 90,000 children brought to Canada in the period of sixty years, the Army has brought about 3,000.

There is a Branch of our Department whose business it is to visit and otherwise look after these juvenile immigrants. These officers discovered that the Army was collecting from the boys placed on farms, an amount equal to and sometimes larger than the passage grant. In the summer of 1924, the Hon. Margaret Bondfield headed a delegation on which were representatives of the British Government, for the purpose of studying the child migration movement to Canada. Miss Bondfield's report, issued at the conclusion of the visit of the delegation, referred to the practice of collecting moneys from boys. The question was taken up both by the Department of Immigration and the Oversea Settlement Department and it was understood that the practice would be discontinued. Instead of discontinuing the practice, however, the Army merely changed the form of doing it and instead of calling it a refund they called it a contribution and represented that it was a voluntary contribution on the part of the boy to the work of the Army, so that some other boy might have an equal chance.

Our Inspectors gave considerable care to this system and in the early autumn of 1926, having received evidence that the Army was enforcing the refund of money and that the boys believed they were refunding passage and were in ignorance of the fact that the British Government and the Canadian Government were sufficiently interested to give them a free passage to Canada in order that they might make a start in agricultural life here, we notified the Army that the practice must be discontinued and sums recovered in this manner must be refunded to the boys and further that until this was done, no further movement of boys under their auspices would be allowed.

While the Minister and the Deputy Minister were in London during June, 1927, Mr. T. C. Macnaghten, Vice-Chairman of the Oversea Settlement Committee who had been negotiating with Commissioner Lamb as representing the Salvation Army, advised the Minister that the Oversea Settlement Committee were agreeable to permitting the Salvation Army to recover £5 from each boy instead of the larger and varied amounts they had previously been collecting. The Minister's decision is embodied in the following letter dated the 14th June, 1927, addressed to Mr. T. C. Macnaghten by Mr. W. J. Egan.

JAS. L. MALCOLM,
Canadian Government Emigration Agent.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, CANADA,
107, Hope Street, Glasgow,

June 14, 1927.

DEAR MR. MACNAGHTEN,—Referring to the recovery of £5 by the Salvation Army from boys who are trained at Hadleigh, the Minister desires me to say that he cannot endorse, and does not approve of, this transaction, especially as no collections are made by other organizations and substantial contributions are made by Governments.

In view of the representations which have been made by the Chairman of the Overseas Settlement Committee and yourself to the effect that your Committee consider the Salvation Army should be permitted to collect £5 from each boy so trained, the Minister has decided to raise no further objection for the time being but reserves the right, without prejudice, to re-open the whole question at a later date.

The Minister is also firmly convinced that boys of tender years should not be asked to sign Contracts or so-called Agreements. He suggests that such
[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Documents should be signed or executed by the Parent or Legal Guardian, and I enclose a sample copy of the form which the Minister has in mind.

Yours faithfully,

Deputy Minister.

T. C. MACNAGHTEN, Esq.,
Vice-Chairman,
Oversea Settlement Committee,
Caxton House, Tothill St.,
London.

I Father (Mother or Guardian)
of who is migrating to
CANADA under the auspices of the Salvation Army understand that the ocean
passage, and rail fare in Canada, have been paid by the Imperial and Canadian
Government. I also understand that the cost of his training at Hadleigh and
Settlement Overseas is being paid for, by the said Government and the Salva-
tion Army.

I agree to permit my Son (or Ward)
to pay to the Salvation Army the sum of £5 as a contribution towards the
Army's Migration Fund, and I authorize the Army to recover this sum from my
son's (or Ward's) employer as a deduction from his wages over a period of not
less than six months or more than eight months from the date on which my son
(or Ward) is placed in work Overseas.

Provided that the Authority hereby conferred shall be null and void unless
my son (or Ward) is earning at least the sum of Ten Dollars per month in addi-
tion to room and board.

.
Parent (or Guardian).

On page 499 of the "Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Select
Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization (No. 17—Wednesday,
May 9, 1928), Mr. Cahan asked that the letters from the boys, who stated that
they were repaying back their passage money, should be produced.

The correspondence shows these boys were under the impression that they
owed their passage to the Salvation Army, e.g., the boy E. Bradshaw stated he
was told that the paper he signed was an agreement to pay £16 to the Army for
his transportation.

Annexed to the correspondence are samples of reports of the Juvenile
Inspectors of the Department. After the report of the Bondfield Delegation,
which visited Canada in 1924, the Department inserted in the form of report the
following questions:—

- Is child required by Agency to repay any sum of money?
- If so, state the amount and cause of the indebtedness.

As a result of these reports, it was decided to write direct to about fifty of
these boys. It was decided not to write to all the boys who had been brought
forward by the above organization lest they might be made restless. These let-
ters conveyed the same information that was given to the Inspectors on their
regular visits, but instead of being replies to question, the letters are voluntary
statement by the boys, in their own handwriting and bearing their signatures.

The difficulty regarding collection has been adjusted by the letter dated
June 14, 1927, which I have already read and which was addressed to Mr. Mac-
naghten by W. J. Egan, Deputy Minister of Immigration.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Copy

231117

July 24th, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—When Mr. Scobie visited you on the 5th of July, you informed him that you had to repay \$100 to the Salvation Army in connection with your migration to Canada. I have taken this matter up with the office of the Salvation Army, 341 University street, Montreal, and have been informed that you are not indebted to the Salvation Army for your transportation to Canada but that you have written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army funds so that other boys might have the same kind of a chance that you have had. Would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document pledging yourself to repay \$100 to the Salvation Army and if you have a copy of the paper which you signed, would you kindly let me have it. For your convenience in replying, please find enclosed an addressed envelope, which requires no postage. Kindly include in your answer a statement as to whether, prior to your coming to Canada, you were on a training farm in England and if so for how long.

With best wishes,
Yours very truly,

Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration.

LEONARD HARDY, Esq.,
c/o George Brown,
R.R. No. 1,
Richmond, Ontario.

SIR,—In reply to your statement which I received on the 26th inst.

I signed a document agreeing to pay to the Salvation Army the sum of \$100 with the understanding that it was for my transportation to Canada and not as a contribution to Army funds.

This document is in England. I think other boys are repaying the money with the same idea.

Those who enter farther into Canada have more than \$100 to pay; therefore it must appear to be the cost of passage.

I was on a training farm for three months but this was termed to be free.

I have been in Canada for six months and during that period have learnt what farm life really is. I can't stand it any longer, so I am going to do my utmost to get back home.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) LEONARD HARDY.

I have notice to leave Mr. G. Brown on August 3rd.

Copy

225189

June 12th, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—You will no doubt recall the visit of Mr. D. M. Morrison, on the 11th of May last. On that occasion you gave Mr. Morrison to understand that you were indebted to the Salvation Army to the extent of \$19, on account of your migration to Canada. We have taken this matter up with the office of the Salvation Army at 341 University street, Montreal, and have been informed that you received no loan from the Salvation Army, but that you have written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army Fund. In this connection would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document pledging yourself to refund any sum of money to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada, also whether you were advised by the Salvation

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Army or by any other person that the two Governments make a grant to the Salvation Army in connection with the migration of boys coming to Canada under the auspices of the Army, also whether prior to your coming to Canada you were on a training farm in England and if so, the period. If you have a copy of any documents signed, would you kindly let me have a copy.

For your convenience in replying, please find enclosed an addressed envelope which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

G. BOGUE SMART,
Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

WM. J. BEAL, Esq.,
c/o H. Delong,
R.R. No. 1, Elgin, Ontario.

Encl.

Copy

c/o Mr. H. P. Delong,
R.R. 1, Elgin, Ont.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter I am sending you full particulars of my emigration to Canada. Before I was accepted for training at the Army's training farm, I signed and filled in forms, in one of which I stated that I would pay £1 to the Army and pay the rest of my debt while in Canada. The other forms merely requested particulars about myself. I was at the Army's training farm seven (7) weeks and there I signed two papers one pledging myself to pay a debt of £19 (English not dollars) for my emigration to Canada and the other to stay on the farm work at least 2 yrs.

On the day of sailing I got a complete outfit of clothes from the S.A. consisting of 1 suit, 1 overcoat, 2 shirts, 2 sets underwear, 1 pr. boots, 1 pr. gloves, 3 pr. socks, also collars, ties, brushes, etc. With regards to my sending a letter to General Booth saying I would contribute to the Army's fund I sent no such letter and I understand my emigration fees to be a debt to the Army. Altogether the cost to myself amounts £20 or nearly \$100.

I remain,

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) W. J. BOAL.

Copy

243936

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

1st June, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND:—Mr. Morrison, who visited you on May 19th, has reported that you informed him you were indebted to the Salvation Army to the extent of \$100 on account of your migration to Canada. In this connection we took the matter up with the officers of the Salvation Army, No. 341 University street, Montreal, and have been informed that you are not indebted to the Salvation Army, but that you have written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army Funds.

Would you kindly let me know whether you were informed by the Salvation Army that the two Governments paid a sum of money to the Salvation Army on account of your coming to Canada. Would you also kindly let me have, if available, a copy of any document you may have signed in regard to the repayment of any money to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada.

Thanking you in anticipation of your early reply.

Yours very truly,

Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration.

Mr. WM. E. FRANKLIN,
c/o Samuel Steacy, Esq.,
R.R. No. 3, Augusta, Ontario.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Copy

c/o Samuel Steacy,
R.R. No. 3,
North Augusta,
Ontario.

8.6.1926.

DEAR SIR:—In answer to your letter dated 1.6.1926, I would state that I was not informed by the Salvation Army that the two Governments paid a sum of money to the Salvation Army on my account of coming to this country. Also that I did not write to General Booth offering to pay the sum of \$100 towards the Salvation Army's funds. I regret that I cannot let you have any document concerning payment of any money to the Salvation Army as I, only signed one of which I did not read, being told by the Salvation Army Officer that it..... asking me to place my signature, promise that I would repay the loan, and would stay where they placed me for at least one year. This paper the Salvation Army kept.

I am,

Yours respectively,

(Signed) WILLIAM E. FRANKLIN.

c/o Mr. Sam Steacy,
R.R. No. 3, North Augusta, Ont.,
15, 2, 1928.

DEAR SIR,—Received your letter dated 28th of January and would like to say that I am well and happy here. I am progressing with my work very well and have paid my debt to the Salvation Army of a \$100 and have \$41 to my name in the bank. Thanking you for your kind enquiries after my welfare.

I remain,

Yours truly,

W. E. FRANKLIN.

The above was in reply to a letter from the Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration as to how he was progressing.

Copy

248667

July 27, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND:—When Mr. Pennock visited you on the 7th of July, you informed Mr. Pennock that you had to refund \$85 to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada. We have taken this matter up with the office of the Salvation Army, and have been advised that you are not indebted to that organization for the cost of your transportation to Canada, but that you have written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army fund, so that other boys may have the same kind of a chance as you have had. In this connection would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document pledging yourself to refund a sum of money to the Salvation Army, and let me have a copy of the paper if you have one. Would you also let me know, whether prior to your migrating to Canada you were on a training farm in England.

For your convenience in replying, please find enclosed an addressed envelope which requires no postage. With best wishes.

Yours very truly,

G. BOGUE SMART,

Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration.

Andrew Allen, Esq.,
c/o Edward Dyer, Esq.,
Wheatland, Manitoba.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Copy

c/o Mr. E. O. Dyer,
Wheatland,
Manitoba.

3/8/26.

DEAR SIR:—In answer to your letter dated July 27, it is quite true I informed Mr. Pennock that I had \$85 to return to the Salvation Army, but I have since discovered that it is 90 dollars for my passage to Canada. I signed a paper pledging myself to return the above sum to the S.A. Further, I never had a copy of it as they kept it. I was on a training farm in England for six weeks, perhaps these letters will help you to find out, also this receipt for the money which Mr. Dyer, my employer, has kindly paid over. Please return letters and receipt.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) ANDREW ALLAN.

248621

July 23rd, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—When Mr. Morison visited you on the 23rd of June, you informed him that you had to repay £6 to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada. We have taken this matter up with the Office of the Salvation Army at Montreal and have been informed that you are not indebted to that Organization for the cost of your passage to Canada but that you have written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army Fund so that other boys may have the same kind of a chance as you have had. Would you kindly let me know whether you signed any Document pledging yourself to repay a certain sum of money to the Salvation Army and if so would you kindly let me have a copy of the Document if you have one. In replying would you kindly let me know whether prior to your migration to Canada you were on a training farm in England. For your convenience in replying please find enclosed, an addressed envelope which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

G. BOGUE SMART,
Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

GEORGE DOUGLAS, Esq.,
c/o Mr. S. R. Joyce,
Wales, Ontario.

Copy/Fr.

c/o Mr. S. R. Joyce,
Wales, Ontario.

DEAR SIR,—Just a few lines to let you know I got your letter. I did sign a paper saying that I would pay back £6 and also a paper to say I would stay at farming 2 years. I was at Hadleigh Colony six weeks before I came to Canada. The Colony is in Essex and I never wrote no letter to General Booth. I signed the papers before I left for Canada. When the Salvation Army man was down to see me I asked him if I could send money to mother, and he said it was better to pay of your debt. That is all I did.

I am,

Yours obediently,

(Sgd.) GEORGE DOUGLAS.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Copy

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

July 19th, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—When Inspector Scobie visited you on the 26th of June, you informed Mr. Scobie that you had to refund £16 to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada. We have taken this matter up with the office of the Salvation Army at 341 University Street, Montreal, and have been informed that you are not indebted to the Salvation Army for your transportation to Canada, but that you had written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army fund, so that other boys may have the same kind of a chance that you have had. Would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document pledging yourself to repay any sum of money, and in case you have a copy of the paper signed would you kindly let me have it. In reply would you also kindly let me know whether prior to your migration to Canada, you were on a training farm in England. For your convenience in replying, please find enclosed an addressed envelope which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

THOMAS BEATTIE, Esq.,
c/o Mr. Archie Ritchie,
Woodlawn, Ontario.

Memorandum:

The report of Inspector of Juvenile Children John A. Gillies who saw Thomas Beattie on the 5th October, 1927, states,—

Thomas said, "I have a good home. It is a fine place. I am staying another year. Yes, we were told in England we owed the Salvation Army £16 for our passage out to Canada."

248622

Copy/Es.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, July 27, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—When Mr. Morrison visited you on the 28th of June, you informed Mr. Morrison that you had to refund £13 to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada. Would you kindly let me know whether you signed any paper pledging yourself to repay this money to the Salvation Army, and let me have a copy of the document if you have one.

We have taken the matter up with the Salvation Army and have been advised that you are not indebted to that Organization for your passage to Canada, but that you have written to General Booth, offering to contribute to the Army funds so that other boys may have the same kind of a chance as you have had. In reply would you kindly let me know whether prior to your migration to Canada you were on a training farm in England.

For your convenience in writing me please find enclosed an addressed envelope which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) G. BOGUE SMART,

Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

BERNARD McMAHON, Esq.,
c/o Wm. Dockstader, Esq.,
Ormond, Ont.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Copies.

Ormond, Ont.,
August 4, 1926.

Mr. G. B. SMART,
Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration,
Ottawa, Ont.

DEAR SIR,—In regard to your letter of July 27, I would state that I signed the paper pledging myself to repay the sum of £13 to the Salvation Army, but the Salvation Army hold this paper. I haven't it in my possession. I have a receipt signed by H. E. Saunders, Cashier, showing the £3 paid by my father.

Previous to my migration to Canada I spent six weeks on a training farm in England.

Hoping this will be satisfactory, I am

Yours respectfully,

(Sgd.) BERNARD McMAHON,

(Sgd.) Per J. DOCKSTEADER.

N.B.—On the back of this sheet of paper you will find a copy of the cash acknowledgment held by me.

BERNARD McMAHON.

Copy:

Feb. 8/1926.

Received from Bernard McMahan the sum of three pounds for passage.

H. E. SAUNDERS,
(Cashier).

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, July 15, 1926.

DEAR SIR,—When Mr. Scobie visited you on the 26th of June you informed him that you had to repay £16 to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada. We have taken this matter up with the office of the Salvation Army at 341 University Street, Montreal, and have been informed as follows:—

With reference to his indebtedness he is not indebted to our organization for his transportation to Canada. He has written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army Funds so that other boys may have the same kind of a chance that he has had.

Would you kindly let me know whether you signed any documents pledging yourself to refund any sum of money to the Salvation Army and if you have a copy of the paper would you kindly let me have it. Would you also kindly let me know whether prior to your migration to Canada you were on a training farm in England. For your convenience in replying, please find enclosed an addressed envelope which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

G. BOGUE SMART;
Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration.

ERIC BRADSHAW, Esq.,
C/o Wm. Gordon, Esq.,
Woodlawn, Ont.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

C/o Wm. Gordon,
Woodlawn, Ont.,
July 23, 1926.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 15th inst. No. 249611, I was led to understand that I was to pay the Army £16 for my passage and outfit.

I signed a paper agreeing to this at Hadleigh Colony, Essex, England, where I was in training for six weeks, but I have not written any letter whatsoever to Gen. Booth to say I would contribute to the Army funds, all I was told was that the paper I was signing of which I have no copy, was an agreement to pay £16 to the Army for my transportation.

Yours truly,

E. BRADSHAW.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, 7th June, 1926.

Dear Friend,—When Inspector Morrison visited you on the 25th May you informed him that you were indebted to the Salvation Army to the extent of £16 on account of your migration to Canada. We have taken this matter up with Brigadier E. J. Pinchen of the Salvation Army, 341 University St., Montreal, and have been informed that you are not indebted to the organization for your actual passage to this country, but that you have written General Booth offering to contribute to the Army funds. In this connection would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document, pledging yourself to repay any sum of money to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada and if so, would you kindly let me have a copy; also whether you were informed by the Salvation Army, or by any person that the two Governments made a grant to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada. I would also be obliged if you would let me know whether you were on a Salvation Army Training Farm prior to your migration to Canada, and if so, for what length of time.

For your convenience in replying you will find enclosed an addressed envelope, which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

G. BOGUE SMART,
Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration.

MR. WILLIAM MCQUIRE,
C/o Neil Morrissey, Esq.,
Jasper, Ont.

R.R. 2, Jasper, Ont., Can.

DEAR FRIEND,—Just a few lines to let you know that I received your welcome letter and was glad to get it.

I must let you know that I never signed any document concerning money matters for my coming to Canada and nobody ever told me that the two Governments made any grant to the Salvation Army on account for me coming out here.

I was in Hadleigh, Essex, England Land Colony for training to come abroad for farming. I was there for three weeks.

Yours truly,

WM. MCQUIRE.

237083-Imm.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

24th June, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—You will no doubt recall the visit of Mr. D. M. Morrison, on the 10th May last. I understand that you told Mr. Morrison you were indebted to the Salvation Army to the extent of \$100.00. We took this matter up with the office of the Salvation Army at No. 341 University street, Montreal, and we have received the following statement:—

Re—*Amos Hawker*

I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of May 15th, and in reply would state that this boy is not indebted to us for his passage over. He has written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army funds so that other boys can have the same kind of a chance that he has had.

I note from this statement that you are said to have written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army funds. Would you kindly let me know whether you have a copy of any paper which you signed in this connection, and if so, would you kindly let me have a copy of it. Would you also kindly let me know whether you were informed by the Salvation Army that the two Governments made a contribution to the Salvation Army on account of their bringing you to Canada.

Thanking you in anticipation of your early reply. With best wishes,

Yours very truly,

.....
Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

Mr. AMOS HAWKER,
 c/o Frank Barker, Esq.,
 R.R. No. 2, Lombardy, Ont.

No. 237083

AMOS HAWKER,
 c/o Frank Barker,
 R.R. No. 2, Lombardy, Ont.

DEAR SIR,—I received your letter dated June 24th, which I am sorry to say I did not answer. I was told on Hadleigh Colony that I had to pay back the sum of £20 or \$100 in return for bringing me to Canada and I signed a paper in this connection. They did not tell me that I was not indebted to them for my passage over. As for signing a paper offering to contribute to the Army funds I have no recollection and I have no copy of such a paper. The Salvation Army did not tell me that the two Governments had made a contribution to them on account of bringing me to Canada.

I hope this will satisfy you and make it quite plain to you the conditions under which I came to Canada.

I remain,

Yours truly,

(Sgd. AMOS HAWKER.

250757

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

May 13th, 1927.

DEAR FRIEND,—I note from the report of our Inspector, who called to see you on the 28th of April, that you state you wrote to the Salvation Army and that a representative of the Army called to see you and that your account was

reduced from \$80 to \$42. Does this mean that the total amount of your account with the Salvation Army is \$42 or does it mean \$42 is the balance of your account? Perhaps you have already paid the difference between \$42 and \$80. Would you kindly let me hear from you in connection at your early convenience.

The enclosed envelope requires no postage.

With best wishes,

Yours very truly,

STANLEY UNSWORTH, Esq.,
c/o Mr. William Overholt,
R.R. No. 4, Simcoe, Ont.

.....
Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

DEAR SIR,—The total amount of my account which I owe the Salvation Army is \$42.50.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) S. UNSWORTH.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

243450

17th August, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—On the 1st June I wrote you asking if you would kindly advise me whether you were informed by the Salvation Army that the two Governments paid a sum of money to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada. As I have not heard from you in reply, my letter may not have reached you. Would you also let me have, if available, a copy of any letter or paper you may have signed in regard to the payment of any money to the Salvation Army on account of your migration.

I will be pleased to hear from you at an early date, and enclosed please find stamped envelope for reply.

Yours very truly,

Mr. JOHN FISH,
c/o Mr. Charles J. McGuire,
R.R. No. 2, Spencerville, Ont.

.....
Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

Sept. 8th, 1926,

5 Hanson St., Off Greenacre Rd.,
Oldham, Lanc., England.

Your Ref. 243450.

SIR:—Just a few lines in regard to my boy which sailed for Canada Jan. 23rd, 1926, from Liverpool after training at Hadleigh Essex for farming, my boy sent me the letter what you sent to him so I have sent him a book and letters to let you see I have paid money to the Salvation Army when they ask for it we was only in poor circumstances when my boy begged for us to sign for him, his father was not working at the time and we have two more children, a little girl 3 years old also a boy 14 years last Jan. 6th, 1926, so you will understand the reason why I let my boy go with the Salvation Army as I could not pay all the money I wrote to them and asked them the reason why my boy had to pay more money back and yet have less wages than the other two boys which left Oldham a month later for Canada they sent me a letter to say I could not expect my boy to get the same on a little farm as a big one but I am glad to know my boy has got a good home also a good master and mistress. He gives them great praise for their kindness to him. I hope you will not be offended at me for taking the liberty in writing to you as a mother's love I felt it my duty to do so from.

Yours,

(Signed) MRS. E. T. FISH.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, July 23rd, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—When Mr. Scobie visited you on the 9th of July, you informed him that you had to repay £16 to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada. Would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document pledging yourself to return this sum of money to the Salvation Army and if you have a copy of the paper signed, would you kindly let me have it. In replying, would you also let me know whether prior to your migration to Canada you were on a training farm in England. For your convenience in replying please find enclosed an addressed envelope which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

G. BOGUE SMART,
Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

FRANK COYNE, ESQ.,
c/o Ernest A. Caldwell,
Bells Corners, Ontario.

P.S.—We have communicated with the Salvation Army and have been informed that you are not indebted to their organization on account of your passage to Canada, but that you have written General Booth offering to contribute to the Army Funds so that other boys may have the same kind of a chance that you have had.

Mr. F. COYNE,
c/o Mr. E. Caldwell.

Bells Corners, Ont., 27 July, 1926.

DEAR SIR,—I received your letter Monday and was very much surprised at your information. I certainly signed two papers one of which I understood was an agreement to pay £16 but I have no copies neither were they given to me to read. Before migrating I was on their training farm at Hadleigh England for a period of one month and I did not write any letters to General Booth offering to contribute.

Yours truly,
F. G. COYNE.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, July 19, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—When I visited you on the 23rd of June, you gave me to understand that you were indebted to the Salvation Army to the extent of £14 on account of your migration to Canada. I have taken this matter up with the office of the Salvation Army at 341 University Street, Montreal, and have been informed that you are not indebted to the Salvation Army for your passage to Canada, but that you had written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army fund, so that other boys may have the same kind of a chance that you have had. Would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document pledging yourself to repay £14 to the Salvation Army. In case you have a copy of the paper signed, would you kindly let me have it, together with information as to whether you were in a training farm in England prior to your migrating to Canada. For your convenience in replying please find enclosed an addressed envelope.

Yours very truly,

G. BOGUE SMART,
Supervisor Juvenile Immigration.

THOMAS ANDERSON, ESQ.,
c/o Mr. George Newman,
Muirkirk, Ontario.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Thomas Anderson,
c/o G. B. Newman, MUIRKIRK, ONT.

DEAR SIR,—I signed a document, prior to sailing, stating that I would pay Salvation Army £14 (fourteen pounds). I regret I haven't a copy of paper that I signed. Prior to sailing I had seven weeks training at Salvation Army Colony, Hadleigh, Essex.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS ANDERSON.

243937.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, 7th June, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—When Inspector Morrison visited you on the 19th May, you informed him that you were indebted to the Salvation Army for a certain sum of money on account of your migration to Canada. We have taken this matter up with Brigadier E. J. Pinchen, of the Salvation Army, 341 University street, Montreal, and have been informed that you are not indebted to the Organization, but that you have written General Booth offering to contribute to the Army funds. In this connection, would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document pledging yourself to repay any sum of money to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada, and if so, would you kindly let me have a copy; also whether you were informed by the Salvation Army, or by any person, that the two Governments made a grant to the Salvation Army on account of migration to Canada. I would also be obliged if you would let me know whether you were on a Salvation Army Training Farm prior to your migration to Canada, and if so, for what length of time.

For your convenience in replying you will find enclosed an addressed envelope, which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) G. BOGUE SMART,

Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration.

Mr. WM. J. WALLACE,
c/o Mr. Charles Whitley,
Spencerville, Ontario.

SPENCERVILLE,

Ontario, 11th June.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter received, I wish you to know that before emigrating to Canada I signed a document to the effect that I was indebted to the Salvation Army for the sum of £20—\$100, towards my passage. I was allowed two years in which to repay the money. I was never informed before concerning any grant made between the two Governments. I was working on the Hadleigh Training Farm, Essex, for six weeks prior to migrating. I hope I have answered your questions satisfactory and I am very much indebted and grateful to all who have taken an interest in my welfare.

I remain,

Yours thankfully,

(Signed) WM. L. WALLACE,

c/o Mr. C. WHITE,

Spencerville,
Ontario.

243951.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, 8th June, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—When Mr. D. M. Morrison visited you on the 20th May you informed him that you were indebted to the Salvation Army to the extent of \$78 on account of your migration to Canada. We took this matter up with the office of the Salvation Army, at No. 341 University street, Montreal, and have been informed by that Organization that you are not indebted to the Salvation Army, but that you have written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army funds so that other boys can have the same kind of a chance that you have had. In this connection would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document pledging yourself to repay any definite sum of money to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada. In case you did would you kindly let me have a copy of the paper you signed. Would you also kindly let me know whether the Salvation Army or any other person advised you that the two Governments made a grant to the Salvation Army on account of your coming to Canada under the auspices of that Organization; also whether you were prior to your coming to Canada on a Salvation Army Training Farm, and if so, for what length of time.

For your convenience in replying please find enclosed an addressed envelope which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) G. BOGUE SMART,

Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration.

Mr. WILLIAM DODD,
c/o E. E. McKendry, Esq.,
Mountain, Ontario.

c/o E. E. McKENDRY,

R.R. 3 Mountain, Ontario, 11-6-26.

DEAR SIR,—I did not write at all to General Booth offering to contribute any sum of money to the Salvation Army but I did sign a paper pledging myself to repay £16—about \$78 which I understood was towards my passage, etc.

I have no copy of the paper that I signed.

The Salvation Army or any other person did not advise me that the two Governments made a grant to the Salvation Army on account of my coming to Canada under this organization.

I was on the S.A. training farm for 7 weeks.

I remain,

Yours truly,

(Signed) WILLIAM F. DODD.

File 243441.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, June 2nd, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—Mr. Morrison, who visited you on the 12th of May, has reported that you informed him that you were indebted to the extent of \$100 to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada. We took this matter up with the office of the Salvation Army and we have been informed that you are not indebted to their Organization, but that you have written General Booth

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

offering to contribute to the Army Fund. Would you kindly let me know whether you have a copy of any paper you signed to this effect, and if so, would you kindly let me have a copy of it.

Yours truly,

(Signed) G. BOGUE SMART,
Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

WILLIAM J. GEDDES, Esq.,
c/o Mr. L. Kilbourn,
R.R. No. 4,
Athens, Ontario.

WM. JOHN GEDDES,
c/o Mr. L. Kilbourn,
R.R. 4, Athens, Ont.,
8/6/26.

DEAR SIR,—When coming to Canada by the Salvation Army I understood that I would have to pay back to them my passage. I signed a form agreeing to pay £20 which I understood was for my passage and some clothes. I know nothing of the Fund you speak of in your letter, and I have no copies of any kind.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) WM. JOHN GEDDES.

File 243952

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, 7th June, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—When Inspector Morrison visited you on the 20th May, you informed him that you were indebted to the Salvation Army to the extent of £14 on account of your migration to Canada. We have taken this matter up with Brigadier E. J. Pinchen, of the Salvation Army, 341 University street, Montreal, and have been informed that you are not indebted to that organization, but that you have written General Booth offering to contribute to the Army funds. In this connection would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document pledging yourself to repay any sum of money to the Salvation Army, on account of your migration to Canada, and if so, would you let me have a copy; also whether you were informed by the Salvation Army, or by any person, that the two Governments made a grant to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada. I would also be obliged if you would let me know whether you were on a Salvation Army Training Farm prior to your migration to Canada, and if so, for what length of time.

For your convenience in replying you will find enclosed an addressed envelope, which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) G. BOGUE SMART,
Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration.

Mr. LOUIS J. GLASS,
c/o Allison Cook, Esq.,
R.R. No. 4, Spencerville, Ont.
[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

SPENCERVILLE, 10th June, 1926.

G. BOGUE SMART, Esq.,

DEAR SIR,—I cannot say much but all I know is that I have the mentioned sum (I made a mistake I payed £3 not £2 as I thought I did leaving £13) to pay back. All I know is that I signed a form (of which I was not given a copy) agreeing to pay back the above sum. I heard about the grant but I thought the fare was £20, £4 being granted by the Government as I (or I believe we) were not told about it. I was for the period of seven weeks at the Colony at Hadleigh, Essex, England. I should like to know the full details about things as I am in the dark about the things you have mentioned. Please let me know if I should ask for the copies that I am supposed to have.

I remain, yours truly,

(Sgd.) L. J. GLASS.

File 243956

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, June 8th, 1926.

DEAR SIR,—When Mr. D. M. Morrison visited you on the 25th of May, you gave him to understand that you were indebted to the Salvation Army to the extent of £16. We took this matter up with the officer of the Salvation Army at 341 University street, Montreal, and we have been informed that you are not indebted to their organization, but that you have written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army funds so that other boys may have the same kind of a chance.

In this connection, would you kindly let me know whether you signed any paper pledging yourself to repay any sum of money to the Salvation Army. If so, would you kindly let me have a copy.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) G. BOGUE SMART,
*Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.*Mr. GEORGE SHAPCOTT,
c/ E. Niblock,
Jasper, Ontario.GEORGE JOHN SHAPCOTT,
c/o S. E. Niblock,
R.R. No. 4, Jasper, Ontario.
13/6/26.

DEAR SIR,—In your letter of the 9th instant, you said you were informed that I had written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army Funds so that other boys may have the same kind of a chance. I have never written to General Booth on this matter but I signed a paper in England which (I was told) compelled me to pay back £16 to the Salvation Army.

As I was not given time to read the paper I signed and a copy was never given to me, I do not really know what I was signing.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) GEORGE JOHN SHAPCOTT.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

May 13, 1927.

DEAR FRIEND,—I note that when our Inspector visited you recently, you inquired about paying the Salvation Army for your passage to Canada. Under the circumstances you may wish to write to the Salvation Army and ask for an itemized statement of their expenditure on your behalf.

Yours very truly,

G. BOGUE SMART,

Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

ALFRED SAMUEL FISHER, Esq.,
c/o Mr. Ernest A. Lindsay,
Tilsonbury, Ontario.

Extract from report of Inspector of Juvenile Immigration, J. A. Gillies who visited Alfred Samuel Fisher on the 20th April, 1927:—

This boy is quite contented but asked me if he had to pay the Salvation Army for his passage over. He said I was told in England by the S. A. officer we had to pay our passage over, one third of the amount had to be paid back to the Dominion Government, the other two thirds to be paid back to the Salvation Army. That is what he told me. I am very sure of course I guess I have to pay the Army the \$77.00 and that is all there is about it.

July 27, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND:—When Mr. Duncan visited you, on the 7th of July, you informed Mr. Duncan that you had to repay £20 to the Salvation Army, on account of your migration to Canada. We have taken this matter up with the office of the Salvation Army, in Montreal, and have been advised that you are not indebted to that Organization, for the cost of your transportation to Canada but that you have written to General Booth and offered to contribute to the Army fund so that other boys may have the same kind of a chance as you have had. In this connection would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document pledging yourself to refund any sum of money? In case you did would you kindly let me have a copy of the paper signed, if you have one, also let me know whether you were on a training farm in England prior to your migrating to Canada.

For your convenience in replying please find enclosed an addressed envelope which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

G. BOGUE SMART,

Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration.

A. C. TONMORE, Esq.,
c/o Alex J. Burnett, Esq.,
R.R. No. 1 Branchton, Ont.

Extract from report of Inspector of Juvenile Immigration, John A. Gillies who visited A. C. Tonmore on the 12th May, 1927:—

He said: I have a good home in every way. Yes I paid the Army \$100 for what I was told was for my passage and clothes. I was in their school at Hadleigh for eight weeks. I got 9 shillings a week and had to work harder than I have here. The clothes I got were very cheap stuff, what they call shoddy, so if I had not to pay for my passage out what are they taking all our money for.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

File 231133.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, June 17th, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—No doubt you will recall the visit of Mr. M. J. Scobie on the 5th March last. On that occasion you gave Mr. Scobie to understand that you were indebted to the Salvation Army to the extent of £16 on account of your migration to Canada. We have written to the Salvation Army and have been advised that you are not indebted to that organization but that you have written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army Funds.

Would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document pledging yourself to return any definite sum of money to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada and if so, would you kindly let me have a copy of the paper signed if it is available. In replying, would you kindly let me know whether prior to your coming to Canada you were on a training farm in England and if so the length of time. For your convenience in writing me please find enclosed an addressed envelope which requires no postage, with best wishes.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) G. BOGUE SMART,

Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

ALBERT J. WOODMAN, Esq.,
c/o Mr. Jas. Fleming,
Woodstock, Ontario.

No. 231133.

R.R. 3 WOODSTOCK, ONT.

DEAR SIR,—In answer to your letter I cannot recall any document concerning money being signed in England. As I was told it would cost me £20 to migrate and my mother paid back £4 last December I thought I had £16 to pay back. If you wish to have some copies of the documents signed please send to Mrs. A. J. Woodman, 2 Tregoll's Rd. Truro, Cornwall, England. I was at Hadleigh Colony, Hadleigh, Essex, for eleven weeks.

I remain,

Yours truly,

(Signed) A. J. WOODMAN,

c/o Mr. Jas. Fleming,
R.R. 3 Woodstock.

File 243935.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, 1st June, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—Mr. Morrison, who visited you on May 19th, has reported that you informed him that you were indebted to the Salvation Army for a certain sum of money on account of your migration to Canada. In this connection we took the matter up with the officers of the Salvation Army, No. 341 University Street, Montreal, and have been informed that you are not indebted to the Salvation Army, but that you have written to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army Funds.

Would you kindly let me know whether you were informed by the Salvation Army that the two Governments paid a sum of money to the Salvation Army on

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

account of your coming to Canada. Would you also kindly let me have, if available, a copy of any document you may have signed in regard to the repayment of any money to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada.

Thanking you in anticipation of your early reply.

Yours truly,

(sgd.) G. BOGUE SMART,
Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration.

Mr. LIONEL COPPLESTONE,
c/o Morton Steacy, Esq.,
North Augusta, Ontario.

LIONEL COPPLESTONE,
c/o Mort Steacy, North Augusta, Ont.

DEAR SIR,—I have just received your letter and I am sorry to say that I have got no copy of the document I signed in England, and that I did not send any letter to General Booth saying that I would contribute to the Army's funds.

Yours truly,

(Signed) L. COPPLESTONE.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

File 243955.

OTTAWA, 7th June, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—When Inspector Morrison visited you on the 25th May you informed him that you were indebted to the Salvation Army to the extent of \$90.00 on account of your migration to Canada. We have taken this matter up with Brigadier E. J. Pinchen, of the Salvation Army, 341 University Street, Montreal, and have been informed that you are not indebted to the Organization for your actual passage to this country, but that you have written General Booth offering to contribute to the Army funds. In this connection would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document, pledging yourself to repay any sum of money to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada, and if so, would you kindly let me have a copy; also whether you were informed by the Salvation Army or by any person that the two Governments made a grant to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada. I would also be obliged if you would let me know whether you were on a Salvation Army training Farm prior to migration to Canada, and if so, for what length of time.

For your convenience in replying you will find enclosed an addressed envelope, which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) G. BOGUE SMART,
Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration.

Mr. RAY SARGINSON,
c/o Edwin Holmes, Esq.,
R.R. No. 4, Smith's Falls,
Ontario.

19th June, 1926

c/o E. HOLMES,

R.R. 4 Smith's Falls, Ontario.

DEAR SIR,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 7th inst and herewith beg to say that I did not write to General Booth offering to contribute to the Army Funds, the only paper that I signed to was to state that I had to pay back £16 or \$80.00, but as you state that I do not owe anything to my actual passage

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

would you kindly state whether I owe anything or not. I cannot furnish a copy of the paper as I did not get one. Would you kindly send me a copy showing where I signed to pay General Booths Fund. Prior to migrating, I was on a farm at Hadleigh Essex England for one month. Hoping this letter meets with your requirements.

I remain,
Yours faithfully,
(Signed) R. SARGINSON,

Extract from a report on Thomas Bolan c/o Alex Dodds, R.R. No. 3, Perth, Lanark County, Burgess Township, Lot 10 Concession 10, by M. J. Scobie, dated 3rd June, 1926.

The boy states he did not have a chance to read agreement which he signed as all was done in a hurry but was told it was £16 repayment for passage.

Extract from a report on Stanley Thorpe c/o G. E. Rowson, R.R. No. 2, Mount Elgin, P.O., Oxford County, Dereham Township, Lot 20 Concession 4, by Inspector D. M. Morrison, dated 2nd September, 1926.

With regard to his indebtedness to the Salvation Army, he said "We (boys) signed a lot of papers they would not let us read 'Come on you are not signing your death warrant,' they told us."

Year of arrival, 1926.
Union, Non.
Report No.
Inspection No.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, CANADA

INSPECTION OF BRITISH IMMIGRANT CHILDREN

Name of child, Bernard Boom. Date of birth, Oct. 15, 1919.
By whom brought to Canada, Salvation Army.
With whom placed, James Wood.
P.O. address, Smith's Falls. Occupation,
Lot 12, Con. 6, Township N. Elmsley.
County Lanark. Province Ontario.
Date child was placed in situation, 3 weeks ago.
Date of most recent inspection by representative of agency, last week.
General character of home and surroundings, good.
Has child a room to himself? Yes. A bed to himself? Yes.
Work in which the child is engaged, general farm.
Health, good.
General appearance, dark, slight, tall boy.
Supply of clothing, good.
Church and Sunday school attendance, S.A., regular.
Day school attendance, Progress,
Supply of suitable reading matter, good.
Recreations, varied.
Pocket money allowance,
Wages and terms of indenture, no agreement as yet.
Does child understand wages to be paid? Yes. What portion of wages is paid directly to child?
Is child required by the agency to repay any sum of money? Yes.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

If so, state amount and the cause of the indebtedness, Father paid £4; still owes £12.
 Complaints by child, none.
 General character and behaviour of the child, good.
 Complaints by employer, none.

INSPECTOR'S REMARKS

This boy states 60 boys were in line and each one was told to sign and move on. He says he may have signed a contract to farm for 10 years for all he knows. He states he understands this money is paid the Army to be refunded to the Government for the amount that they put forward.

Date of Inspection, June 2, 1926.

Inspector, (Sgd.) M. J. SCOBIE.

Copy

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, 16th June, 1926.

DEAR FRIEND,—You will no doubt recall the visit Mr. Scobie paid you on the 2nd June. On that occasion I understand you informed Mr. Scobie that your father had paid £4 to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada, and that you still owed £12. I took this matter up with the office of the Salvation Army, No. 341 University Street, Montreal, P.Q., and in this connection I have been advised that you are not indebted to the Salvation Army, but that you have written General Booth offering to contribute to the Army funds.

Would you kindly let me know whether you signed any document pledging yourself to repay a sum of money to the Salvation Army on account of your migration to Canada, also whether you were advised by the Salvation Army or by any person that the British and Canadian Governments made a per capita grant to the Salvation Army on account of certain boys coming to Canada under the auspices of the Salvation Army. In case you were on a training farm prior to your migration to Canada, would you kindly advise me.

For your convenience in replying you will find enclosed an addressed envelope which requires no postage.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) G. BOGUE SMART,

Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

Mr. BERNARD BOOM,
 c/o James Wood, Esq.,
 Smith's Falls, Ontario.

Copy

B. BOOM,

c/o Mr. James Wood,
 Smith's Falls, R.R. 2, 22/6/26.

SIR,—I have received your letter to-day and thank you for taking so much trouble on my behalf.

When Mr. Scobie came on the 2nd June I told him that my mother paid £4 in England before I left and got a receipt for it.

My business with the Salvation Army dates from February 4th, 1926. On the night of February 3rd I received a letter from the Army informing me that I was to report for training the next day. I enclose the same letter which I have

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

saved. I was there for six weeks and some odd days. I sailed on 26th March, 1926.

During my stay at Hadleigh farm Colony Adjutant Phibbs, the officer what is in charge of the immigration section came to Hadleigh and myself and about 30 others signed two papers, one he said was a landing paper we could not land without it, the other he told me was saying that I agreed to pay back what money I owed that money I concluded was for my passage. I have already paid \$10 to Mr. Brace.

As to the question whether the Government loan the Army any money. That was talk among the boys at Hadleigh.

Would you mind asking for a facsimile of the papers I have signed and then we will know exactly how I stand.

Would you mind asking what the \$50 I now owe them is for and let me know.

I remain,

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) BERNARD E. BOOM.

Year of arrival, 1926.

Union, None.

Report, N.

Inspection No.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, CANADA

INSPECTION OF BRITISH IMMIGRANT CHILDREN

Name of child, James McDonald. Date of birth, 18/2/09.

By whom brought to Canada, Salvation Army.

With whom placed, Joseph Hyland.

P.O. address, Jarvis, occupation, farmer.

Lot 22, Con. 7, Township, Walpole.

County, Haldimand, province, Ontario.

Date child was placed in situation, February 28th, 1926.

Date of most recent inspection by representative of agency, around August 1926, but missed seeing him.

General character of home and surroundings, good.

Has child a room to himself? Yes. A bed to himself? Yes.

Work in which the child is engaged, farming.

Health, good.

General appearance, tall youth, comfortably clothed.

Supply of clothing, yes.

Church and Sunday school attendance, attentive to church obligations.

Day school attendance, no. Progress.

Supply of suitable reading matter, yes.

Recreations.

Pocket money allowance, given when wanted.

Wages and terms of indenture, yearly wages \$150 with board.

Does child understand wages to be paid? Yes. What portion of wages is paid directly to child?

Is child required by the agency to repay any sum of money? See remarks.

If so, state amount and the cause of the indebtedness.

Complaints by child, none.

General character and behaviour of the child, satisfactory.

Complaints by employer, no complaints.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

INSPECTOR'S REMARKS

From Mr. Hyland I received a good report regarding the young man; he was always willing and furthered matters to the best of his ability.

In regard to money repayments to the Agency: James said he signed papers before sailing along with other lads, to pay around \$120, covering passage and clothing outfit which Mr. Hyland informed him sometime ago he did not have to do.

As the lad seemed puzzled in the matter, he asked for an explanation.

Date of Inspection, April 20th, 1927.
Inspector (Sd.) James Duncan.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, April 26, 1927.

DEAR FRIEND:—I note that when Mr. James Duncan visited you on the 13th April, 1926, you informed Mr. Duncan that you had to repay £20 to the Salvation Army on account of your passage and outfit and that when Mr. Duncan visited you on the 20th April, 1927, you said you had to pay about \$120, covering passage and clothing. I feel that under the circumstances it might be well for you to write to the Salvation Army and get an itemized statement in regard to the amount which you are expected to pay.

Yours truly,

(Sd.) G. BOGUE SMART,

Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

James McDonald, Esq.,
c/o Mr. Joseph Hyland,
Jarvis, Ontario.

James McDonald,
c/o Joseph Hyland, R.R. 1 Jarvis,
County Haldimand, Ontario.

DEAR SIR.—Please find enclosed the reply from the Salvation Army after enquiring as to the amount I was expected to repay and hope it is of value.

Yours truly,

(Sd.) JAMES McDONALD.

BURNSIDE LODGE,
808 Dundas Street, Woodstock, Ontario, May 3, 1927

Mr. James McDonald,
c/o Joseph Hyland,
R.R. No. 1, Jarvis, Ont.

DEAR FRIEND—I have your letter of April 30th to hand and note the contents. I beg to say that everything, your passage, outfit, travelling in the old country, supervision, etc., was \$100, of this amount \$52.13 has been paid, this leaves \$47.87 outstanding and I am sure you would have no difficulty in clearing this off this year and saving considerable money.

I trust this will be satisfactory, to you.

Yours sincerely

(Sd.) LOUIS H. SMITH,

Commandant.

Year of arrival
 Union
 Report No.
 Inspection No.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, CANADA

INSPECTION OF BRITISH IMMIGRANT CHILDREN

Name of child, Philip Ross. Date of birth, 1/4/09.
 By whom brought to Canada, S.A.
 With whom placed, E. M. Nethercott.
 P.O. address, R.R. No. 1, St. Thomas. Occupation, farmer.
 Lot 25, Con. Talbot Road, Township Southwold.
 County, Elgin. Province, Ontario.
 Date child was placed in situation, 8/6/25.
 Date of most recent inspection by representative of agency, June, 1926.
 General character of home and surroundings, Good home, clean.
 Has child a room to himself? Yes. A bed to himself? Yes.
 Work in which child is engaged, farm work.
 Health, good.
 General appearance, medium sized, bright, alert.
 Supply of clothing, good.
 Church and Sunday school attendance, yes. Yes.
 Day school attendance, no. Qualifying.
 Supply of suitable reading matter, yes, paper and magazines.
 Recreations, yes, usual on farm.
 Pocket money allowance, gets some, no stated amount.
 Wages and terms of indenture, \$125 a year. Board and washing.
 Does child understand wages to be paid? Yes.
 Is child required by the agency to repay any sum of money? Yes.
 If so, state amount and the cause of the indebtedness. Paid \$100 for passage and some clothes.
 Complaints by child, none.

 General character and behaviour of the child. Good. Good.
 Complaints by employer, none. This boy cannot be beat. He is a dandy.

INSPECTOR'S REMARKS

Philip said this home is about right in every way and has been. I have read in the papers we did not have to pay for our passage over. I have paid \$100 for passage and clothes. I got clothes about \$15 worth. Yes, I was six weeks in the Army School. I read the agreement, I would not sign it until I read it, it said passage, clothes and other things. I did not get a copy. I know a fellow who did get a copy or said it was a copy.

Date of Inspection, April 6, 1927.

Inspector, John A. Gillies.

ST. THOMAS, R.R. No. 1,
 ONTARIO, CANADA,

Monday, July.

DEAR SIR,—I am just writing to find out and awaiting your instructions regarding the payment due the Salvation Army. I have enclosed copy of typed letter which I received from the Salvation Army and my year finished up on July 8th. I have not drawn my pay yet and will be glad to receive your letter of advice, thanking you.

I am yours truly,

(Sgd.) PHILIP ROSS.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

DEAR FRIEND,—I have your letter to hand and beg to say we are unable to send you a receipt for the amount of \$78.14 paid in your interest by Mr. Nethercott as the receipt always goes to the man paying the money, but this letter will serve as your receipt as you will note it states above that \$78.14 has been paid on account. There is a small balance of \$21.86 now outstanding. Your loan account was of course for your passage to Canada and for your kit and training at Hadleigh, etc. I trust this explanation will be satisfactory to you and we are glad to know that you are getting on real well.

Yours sincerely,

LOUIS H. SMITH,

Commandant.

Year of arrival, 1926.....
 Union, None.....
 Report No.
 Inspection No.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, CANADA

INSPECTION OF BRITISH IMMIGRANT CHILDREN

Name of child, John Wilfred Jones. Date of birth, 20/1/12.
 By whom brought to Canada, Salvation Army.
 With whom placed, Harold Styles.
 P.O. address, R.R. No. 3 Kinburn. Occupation, farmer, lot 16, con. 8, township Fitzroy, county Carleton, province, Ontario.
 Date child was placed in situation, 7/6/26.
 Date of most recent inspection by representative of agency, May, 1927.
 General character of home and surroundings, good home, clean.
 Has child a room to himself? Yes. A bed to himself? Yes.
 Work in which the child is engaged, farm work.
 Health, good.
 General appearance, well developed, bright.
 Supply of clothing, good.
 Church and Sunday school attendance, not regular. No.
 Day school attendance, no. Progress, 7th standard.
 Supply of suitable reading matter, papers.
 Recreations, yes, goes out.
 Pocket money allowance, \$2 a month.
 Wages and terms of indenture, \$10 a month, board, etc.
 Does child understand wages to be paid? Yes. What portion of wages is paid directly to child?
 Is child required by the agency to repay any sum of money? Yes.
 If so, state amount and the cause of the indebtedness, \$80 for passage over.
 Complaints of child, none.
 General character and behaviour of the child, good. Good.
 Complaints by employer, non.

INSPECTOR'S REMARKS

John said "I am well pleased with my home."

When asked as to the cause of his indebtedness to the Army he said, "We were told in good plain English before we came over by the High Officials of the Salvation Army that we would have to pay them back the passage money that they were paying for us. I see by the newspapers that was free. Well mine is paid all but \$10. I suppose we will not get any back."

Date of inspection, October 5th, 1927.

Inspector (Sd.) John A. Gillies.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Year of arrival, 1926.....
 Union, None.....
 Report No.
 Inspection No.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, CANADA

INSPECTION OF BRITISH IMMIGRANT CHILDREN

Name of child, Samuel McDonald. Date of birth, 1/10/10.
 By whom brought to Canada, Salvation Army.
 With whom placed, Earl Fentie.
 P.O. address R.R. 3 Springfield. Occupation,
 Lot 1, Con. 8, Township Dorchester.
 County, Elgin, Province, Ontario.
 Date child was placed in situation, 4/9/26.
 Date of most recent inspection by representative of agency, Fall 1926.
 General character of home and surroundings, good home, clean.
 Has child a room to himself? Yes. A bed to himself? Yes.
 Work in which the child is engaged, farm work.
 Health, good.
 General appearance, well developed, bright boy.
 Supply of clothing, good.
 Church and Sunday school attendance, yes regular, yes regular.
 Day school attendance, no. Progress, 1st year High School.
 Supply of suitable reading matter, yes, papers and books.
 Recreations, yes all I want.
 Pocket money allowance, \$2 a month.
 Wages and terms of indenture, \$120 a year, board, etc.
 Does child understand wages to be paid? Yes. What portion of wages is paid
 directly to child?
 Is child required by the agency to repay any sum of money? Yes.
 If so, state amount and the cause of the indebtedness, \$80 for passage over.
 Complaints by child, none.
 General character and behaviour of the child, good, good.
 Complaints by employer, none.

INSPECTOR'S REMARKS

Sam said he was well pleased with his home and treatment; he further said
 "I see that the Government paid our passage over. We were told we had to pay
 part or all our passage. Yes we signed a paper but we had to sign it or stay at
 home—we were not even allowed to read it. I do not like paying for something
 I do not know what it is."

Date of inspection, April 7th, 1927.

Inspector (Sd.) John A. Gillies.

On page 500 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Select Stand-
 ing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, Staff Captain Owen Culshaw of
 the Salvation Army, made the following statement:

The position of affairs led up, on October 4th, to a letter being re-
 ceived by our headquarters in London stating that unless we ceased to
 collect the money from those boys, by promise or otherwise, we could not
 continue in this work of migration. At that time, we had about 80 boys
 on our farm colony at Hadleigh who had been promised to go to Canada,
 subject to Government permission. We were practically committed to that.

We had brought them from their homes and we appealed, asking that judgment might be stayed until Commissioner Lamb had an opportunity of making personal representations to the Minister on the business. However, the embargo held and these boys were left on the farm there, left on our hands. Negotiations were taken up with the British Government and through their good offices, it is now being arranged that the boys will repay the sum of \$25 as a voluntary contribution towards the work that the Army is doing on their behalf.

The above statement leaves the impression that no boys were brought to Canada by the Salvation Army until arrangements had been made for the repayment of \$25.

Annexed hereto are copies of letters showing,—

1. That Salvation Army boys were brought to Canada during the calendar year 1927 and placed by the British Immigration and Colonization Association and by the Salvation Army.
2. Correspondence between Mr. J. Bruce Walker, Director of Emigration, London and Mr. W. C. Noxon, Agent General for Ontario, regarding Salvation Army boys who were brought from the Salvation Army Training Farm at Hadleigh and placed by the Provincial Government of Ontario during 1927.
3. Boys over 17 years of age (designated as adults within the meaning of the Assisted Passage Agreement) who were brought from the Salvation Army Farm at Hadleigh during the season of 1927 under the Canadian Pacific Railway quota and placed not by the Canadian Pacific Railway, but by the Salvation Army in Ontario.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

CANADA

OTTAWA, 12th May, 1928.

MEMORANDUM:

Mr. W. J. EGAN,
Deputy Minister.

I beg to inform you that the following parties of Salvation Army boys were brought to Canada during the calendar year 1927 and placed under the auspices of the British Immigration and Colonization Association:

March 13th, 1927..	34	
March 27th, 1927..	13	
April 17th, 1927..	12	59

In addition to the above the following parties were officially listed as coming under the auspices of the British Immigration and Colonization Association but were received and placed by the Salvation Army:

August 6th, 1927..	47	
September 17th, 1927..	2	49
Total..		108

G. BOGUE SMART,
Supervisor, Juvenile Immigration.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

W. C. NOXON,

Agent-General in the British Isles,

163 Strand, London, W.C. 2,

February 15th, 1927.

J. BRUCE WALKER, Esq.,

Director—Migration,

Canadian Building, Trafalgar Square, S.W. 1.

Dear Mr. WALKER,—We have received through the Salvation Army applications from 82 boys under 17 years of age who desire to sail at the earliest possible date. We have treated these applications in every respect as though coming direct from the boys, and judging them on this basis a considerable number have been rejected on first perusal. We have verified the references of the others, and I am arranging for our Mr. Percival to interview them on Thursday and Friday of this week. These considered suitable at interview, and for whom satisfactory references have been obtained, will be asked to submit medical certificate, and as all the boys are at present at the Salvation Army Training Farm at Hadleigh, this will be very much facilitated. It is quite possible that we will let you have the Requisitions complete early next week.

I am advising you this now as this will naturally mean a considerable lot of work for the time being for your office, as we will be desirous of having the Party sail as early as possible. We had not anticipated these applications, but now that we have them we are anxious to have those who prove acceptable sail and be cleared out from Vimy Ridge Farm before our "Letitia" Party which sails on March 12th arrives.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) WM. C. NOXON,

Agent-General for Ontario.

THE CANADIAN BUILDING,

TRAFALGAR SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1, February 16th, 1927.

DEAR MR. NOXON,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter (SEP/EIN) of February 15th, advising me that you have received, through the Salvation Army, applications from 82 boys under 17 years of age who desire to sail at the earliest possible date.

I understand it is your intention to place these boys through your Government on the Vimy Ridge Farm, and that they shall be distributed from the Vimy Ridge Farm in the same manner as boys sent out under your own direct Government efforts.

You are probably aware that the Department has taken strong objection to the Salvation Army boys, trained at the Salvation Army Camp at Hadleigh, being required to pay a contribution of \$80.00 from their wages after settlement in Canada, the amount so paid being understood to be the necessary transportation for the boy's passage and a contribution towards assisting a succeeding boy, the contribution for the succeeding boy amounting to £8, or roughly \$40.00.

As all these transportation charges are met by a joint contribution from the Oversea Settlement Committee and the Dominion Government, the Dominion Government has taken pointed exception to any condition that requires the boys to make a payment for such services, and the Department further objects to a boy having to undertake over his own signature, a promise to repay a sum of money under the impression that such sum of money is to be used for paying the transportation or other expenses of himself and a succeeding boy.

The Salvation Army have been asked to give the Department a written assurance that no such funds for that or any other purpose will be deducted

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

from the earnings of boys after they get to Canada. So far the Salvation Army have declined to give the Department the required assurance, and in the absence of that assurance the Department has decided not to accept boys trained by the Salvation Army at Hadleigh and for placement by the Salvation Army in Canada.

As these boys are going to Vimy Ridge Farm—as I understand it, to be distributed from there by the Ontario Government—the matter assumes somewhat of a different aspect, but in order that my instructions may be carried out and that the boys may be safeguarded with respect to future financial commitments, I shall be glad to have your assurance that the boys accepted from the Salvation Army have not been asked, either verbally or by document, to make any contribution for any purpose after they arrive in Canada, and that in future no such request for a contribution under this head will be made from these boys.

If you are able to assure me on these points there seems to be no reason why the movement of these boys should not proceed as if it had been business that originated entirely through themselves.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) J. BRUCE WALKER,
Director.

W. C. NOXON, Agent-General in the British Isles,
163 STRAND, LONDON, W.C. 2, February 17th, 1927.

DEAR MR. WALKER,—

Re Salvation Army Boys

Replying to your favour of the 16th instant. When Commissioner Lamb spoke to me about these boys, I told him I would take them in the same manner and under same conditions as boys from any other source and that we would not permit, for a moment, any contribution by the boys towards the Salvation Army any more than from boys taken in the regular way, and that they would be handled in exactly the same way as our own lads. We are doing this to help out a situation in which the Army find themselves at Hadleigh. I might say for your information that out of the number which they submitted to us a very large proportion were turned down without any further investigation whatever, and respecting the balance we sent out our own information forms in order that everything would be satisfactory according to our method and requirements. Mr. Percival is at Hadleigh to-day and to-morrow interviewing each boy that we consider favourable. I understand the situation from your point of view thoroughly, and can assure you that we will not allow any of the boys' wages to be used as a contribution to the Army. Their money will be handled in exactly the same manner as our own boys', namely the boy to receive one-half of his wages and the other half to be placed to his credit with the Government.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) WM. C. NOXON.

J. BRUCE WALKER, Esq.,

Director, Department Immigration and Colonization,
The Canadian Building, S.W. 1.

P.S.—Recently the Canadian Pacific Railway took some thirty boys to British Columbia from the Salvation Army at Hadleigh and we presume under same conditions as we are doing.

OTTAWA, May 12th, 1928.

Memorandum

During the season of 1927, there were, according to the Departmental record, 149 single men varying in age from 17 to 19, who came to Canada under the Canadian Pacific quota after recruitment by Salvation Army sources in Great Britain.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

They sailed in groups as follows:—

March 17.	35
April 8.	21
May 6	26
June 3.	18
July 29	49

149

One hundred and twenty-one files have been examined and show that 96 of these youths gave their addresses in Great Britain as "S.A. Farm, Hadleigh", or "Hadley, Essex". The remaining 25 gave addresses at various points in the British Isles.

It is clear, therefore, that at least 96 were definitely Hadleigh trained boys, but it is desirable to pursue the inquiry a little further as to the balance of 25. In 23 cases of the 25 the Information Forms with the exception of personal details, were completed in the same hand as those which are clearly Hadleigh cases. All the forms in response to the questions 15 and 15A, "Is such occupation assured" and "By whom" give "Yes", "The Salvation Army". In response to 19, "How many years have you farmed?" the reply is given, "In training", and in response to 24, "If you are in communication with a Shipping or Booking Agent, give his name and address", the name "Commissioner D. C. Lamb, 3 Upper Thames St., London, E.C. 4", is put in with a rubber stamp. All these forms bear endorsements in exactly the same phrase signed by Major A. Ewan Moore of the Canadian Pacific, "Interviewed applicant today, he is partially trained and I consider that he is suitable for farm work".

Except for the personal details there is nothing which shows the cases of those who gave their addresses as other than Hadleigh, to be different in any way from the definite Hadleigh cases. It is quite apparent that all were in fact Hadleigh boys who were just over the juvenile age and could, therefore, be dealt with as single men under the Canadian Pacific quota.

On page 503 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, No. 17, Staff Captain Culshaw of the Salvation Army gave the following replies to questions regarding contributions and expenditures on boys:—

"By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. How much money from voluntary subscriptions or from your treasury do you have to pay on the average?—A. £10 per head.

Q. That is found from other sources than from the British Government, the Canadian Government and what the boys pay back?—A. After pooling all the resources we can get it costs our funds £10 per head.

"By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. The total amount received by the Salvation Army from all sources, government grants, sums repaid by the boys and so forth, does not as a matter of fact come anywhere near meeting the amount expended by the Army per head on the boy?—A. Absolutely not."

The following statement shows the contributions to, and collection by, the Salvation Army in the case of boys:—

The Salvation Army receives:

	Per boy
1. Difference between grant of \$80 from British and and Dominion Government and actual cost of ocean fare £11.10 being £4.18.9 or	\$ 24 02
2. Grant by Dominion Government to Hadleigh Farm.	10 00

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

3. British Government training grant from £3 to £18 per capita. Maximum contribution.....	87 60
(See note to this memorandum)	
4. British Government cost of outfit £3 per capita.	14 60
5. British Government aftercare £2.10 per capita....	12 16
6. At least one Provincial Government grant of....	35 00
7. Collection from boy £5.....	25 00

Total..... \$208 38

8. Joint grant by British and Dominions Governments on account of transportation of each boy east of Manitoba—\$80 less \$24.02 as shown by item No..	\$ 55 98
---	----------

\$264 36

Fare allowed for each boy West of Ontario is \$100, i.e., \$20.00 additional to points West of Ontario	20 00
--	-------

Total..... \$284 36

NOTE.—The contribution by the Oversea Settlement Department on account of training is as follows:—

(a) In respect of the first 500 boys trained under this Scheme to pay one-half of the net ascertained expenditure incurred in maintenance and training at the Farm provided that the Department will not pay more than 15/ per week per boy.

(b) In respect of boys over and above the first 500 trained under this Scheme to pay the whole of the said net ascertained expenditure on maintenance and training provided that—

The Department shall not pay more than 30/ per week per head for such boys at the Farm.

The training under the above Scheme does not extend over a period of less than four weeks or (without the prior approval of the Oversea Settlement Department) more than twelve weeks.

For the information of the Committee I also desire to submit the following information regarding contributions to what are designated Provincial Training Farms:—

1. The Provincial Government supplies the farm.
2. The cost of operation is divided as follows:—

	Per boy
Provincial Government	\$ 10 00
Department of Immigration.....	10 00
Oversea Settlement Department.....	20 00

Total..... \$40 00

Assuming actual average cost of transportation— joint grant by British Government and Dominion Government east of Manitoba.....	80 00
---	-------

Total..... \$120 00

West of Ontario—\$100 i.e., \$20 additional to points west of Ontario.....	20 00
---	-------

Total..... \$140 00

The following is a comparative statement of cost per boy as between a Provincial centre and the Salvation Army:—

	East of Manitoba	West of Ontario
Salvation Army.....	\$264 36	\$284 36
*Plus £10.....	48 66	48 66
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Provincial Centre.....	\$313 02	\$333 02
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Maximum expenditure per boy by Salvation Army in excess of expenditure per boy by Provincial Centre	\$120 00	\$140 00
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$193 02	\$193 02

The minimum wage paid to a boy who comes to Canada under the Provincial Training Scheme is the same as the minimum wage paid to a boy who is brought to Canada and placed by the Salvation Army notwithstanding the fact that the Army received a training grant of from £3 to £18 per boy for training on what is known as the Hadleigh Farm near London, England.

3. *The movement of Women for domestic service*

The Immigration Branch of the Salvation Army has been quite free to move houseworkers with experience in house work and of a suitable type, regardless of the numbers. The offer of a £2 ocean passage, with corresponding low rail rate to destination in Canada is a great incentive to misrepresentation and our experience is that many young women, unaccustomed to house work, but accustomed to factory or other industrial or shop employment, are willing to declare their intention to take housework in order to get the cheap rate. We have developed in connection with the Empire Settlement Agreement a nomination scheme, by which prospective employers in Canada, whether agriculturists or householders in towns or cities may nominate by name or by description any experienced or inexperienced houseworker. In order to protect the cheap rate, which is but another way of saying protect Canada against the payment of passage of those who are not of the class eligible for passage assistance, we move the inexperienced girl only on nomination. We inquire into the circumstances of the nominator on this side and if we find that the nominator wants inexperienced help, we get that help for them. We do not ourselves bring to Canada any number of inexperienced women without having nominations and we do not and cannot allow anyone else to do it.

It was only late last autumn that the Army decided to develop nominations in Canada for the inexperienced houseworker. Forms of nomination for inexperienced houseworkers have been submitted during the current year by the Salvation Immigration and Settlement Department. Many of these descriptive nominations have been turned down upon the following grounds:—

- (a) Employers had already secured help. A number of them did not want help when they signed the nominations, but stated the nomination forms were signed to oblige the Army and because the Army said that otherwise they would not be able to move women.
- (b) Some employers said that they would not take the inexperienced girl if she had been in industrial employment.
- (c) Some homes were found unsatisfactory.

Our own experience is that girls coming from homes that in many cases consist of two or three rooms, who have never had any experience outside their own homes, but who on the other hand have been wage-earners in other occupa-

* Staff Captain Culshaw stated page 503 that the Salvation Army paid on the average £10 per head per boy from voluntary subscriptions.

tions, are not qualified for house work here and frequently are not content to remain at the unaccustomed work and longer hours and incidentally smaller pay than that to which they have been accustomed. They, therefore, leave domestic service, if indeed some of them ever accept such employment, and seek other work. Now Toronto reports many hundreds of this class of girls seeking industrial work and refusing to take domestic work and the Army proposes to move most of these classes to Toronto.

What the Army want is a quota of what they call "domesticated women" which means women without domestic experience, but who are willing to say they will be domestics in Canada and thus secure the cheap rate. No quota of that sort has been given to any person or organization since the Empire Settlement Passage Scheme became effective.

Under the Assisted Passage Agreement the Department of Immigration agreed to give aftercare during a period up to five years estimated at £6 or \$29.20 per migrant as an equation against a similar cash contribution by the Oversea Settlement Department on account of transportation in the case of an Empire Settlement adult migrant, i.e., over 17 years of age. The Salvation Army also have an Agreement with the Oversea Settlement Department of the British Government for the aftercare of single women who migrate under an Agreement between the Salvation Army and the Department.

Under the Agreement between the Salvation Army and the Oversea Settlement Department the Army shares equally in the net approved expenses of the reception, settlement and aftercare in Canada provided that, in the case of women assisted under the Agreement between the Department and the British Government, an amount of £5 or \$24.33 is deducted from what is designated as "approved expenses" before calculating the contribution to the Salvation Army by the Oversea Settlement Department for aftercare. This amount is deducted on account of the aftercare service rendered by the Department.

The aftercare by the Department extends for a period of five years and the aftercare by the Salvation Army is for a period of not less than two years or more than three years from the date of arrival. This arrangement means that the Department gives aftercare during a period of five years so that the migrant can receive the benefit of the equation up to £6 or \$29.20 for ocean passage whereas the Salvation Army give aftercare for two or three years within the five year period which, of course, means over-lapping in aftercare as between the Department and the Salvation Army. After deducting the sum of \$24.33 on account of aftercare by the Department the Army then receives £1.17.6 or \$9.11 during the first year and 6s.3d. or \$1.52 per annum for two subsequent years.

For women who are not considered eligible for assistance under the official Agreement, i.e., the Agreement between the Department of Immigration and the Oversea Settlement Department—but who are eligible under the provisions of the Immigration Act and who are coming to Canada under the category of "Domesticated Women" which means clerks, factory workers, shop girls, etc., employed or unemployed, the Salvation Army receive for aftercare from the Oversea Settlement Department the sum of £4 or \$19.46 per woman in the first year and 10s. or \$2.43 per annum for two subsequent years for aftercare.

Commissioner David C. Lamb of the Salvation Army interviewed the Deputy Minister and other officials of the Department of Immigration at Ottawa on the 21st and 22nd of December 1926.

During the discussion of the Machinery in Canada of the Immigration Branch of the Salvation Army, the following information was developed regarding Salvation Army hostels and their operation:—

- (1) Moncton. This is for boys and young women. During this season 47 boys and 45 women have been brought to this hostel and the operating costs for the year are placed at \$6,750.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

- (2) Smith's Falls and Woodstock. These lodges are for boys. 479 boys are said to have been brought out this year. The maintenance cost of these two institutions is \$19,100 for the year.
- (3) London and Toronto. These institutions are for young women. There is another one in Toronto for women and children. The number of young women brought during the year was 696. The maintenance cost for the year was \$30,100. Apparently \$12,000 of this was for one of the Toronto institutions for women and children.
- (4) Winnipeg. This hostel is for women and 32 young women are said to have been accommodated during the year with a maintenance cost for the institution of \$9,000.
- (5) Brandon. The hostel is for boys. Maintenance cost for the year was \$9,400, but no boys were brought to Canada.
- (6) Vancouver. The Vancouver lodge accommodates both women and boys. During the year 23 women and 12 boys were accommodated and five families in addition. The maintenance cost was \$6,300.

We regard the cost of the upkeep of the Salvation Army system of Hostels as entirely too high. We advised the Salvation Army that we would take over all the houseworkers and handle them through our Hostel system without any cost to the Salvation Army. This offer has several times been repeated but refused by Commissioner Lamb of the Immigration Department of the Salvation Army. We have a system of Hostels, each run under local management, but each supported by a Federal grant and most of them by a Provincial grant. These Hostels are not full. They could easily accommodate the few hundred houseworkers brought by the Army without any appreciable cost to us. The Department take the view that the tax-payers of this country should not be called upon to meet the demand of the Salvation Army for a grant of \$1,000 to each of some eight or ten or more Salvation Army Hostels merely because the Army prefers to run a separate Organization parallel to the one recognized and supported by the Department of Immigration. The basis of the proposal by the Department was closer co-operation between the Department and the Salvation Army and to eliminate the duplication of effort and expenditure. As a matter of fact it is in direct line with the suggestion of co-ordination of effort and expenditure.

The following is a brief description of what are known as Canadian Women's Hostels:—

Memorandum

1. Canadian Women's Hostels.
2. Institutions which receive per diem allowance.
3. Hostel machinery of the Salvation Army.

On page 504 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, (No. 17), dated Wednesday, May 9th, 1928, Staff Captain Owen Culshaw of the Salvation Army gave evidence regarding the case of one Mary Dickson. In reply to a question by the Honourable Mr. Edwards, Captain Culshaw replied as follows:—

“Q. The Government claimed that you had been asking improperly for repayments from Mary Dickson?—A. We did not ask for a penny.

Q. You say you did not ask for a penny?—A. No, Sir, and I think we have satisfied the Government to that effect.”

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

An Inspector of the Juvenile Branch of the Department called several times to see Mary Dickson but was not successful until the third visit which was on May 4th, 1926. The following is an extract from Juvenile Inspector's report in this case:—

“Q. Is child required by the agency to repay any sum of money?

A. Yes.

Q. If so, state amount and the cause of the indebtedness.

A. Believed to be \$100 for transportation.”

Under date of the 20th of August, 1926, the Supervisor of Juvenile Immigration wrote Mrs. Dickson and asked for a statement as to indebtedness of this girl. Mrs. Dickson's reply, which is dated the 24th of August, 1926, reads as follows:—

“With reference to your letter of the 20th instant regarding my daughter Mary's immigration to Canada, I beg to mention that she did get a loan of \$100 from the Salvation Army, which she promised to refund by monthly instalments. She also signed a form regarding same.

You inquire as to whether I signed any forms agreeing to refund the money. I signed only one paper as I sailed a few weeks before my daughter. It referred to the general rules of immigration.

Should further information be required, it will be furnished by Mrs. George Dickson, 5 Brachelston Street, Greenock, Scotland.

Thanking you for your kind consideration in my case.”

The Director of Emigration in London was instructed to inquire and submit a report on the statement that Mary Dickson was indebted to the Salvation Army. The following reply, dated the 14th of September, 1926, was received from the Director:—

“If you will kindly refer to your file number 85203 you will find that the practice of allowing children other than wards of Societies to take advantage of the free passage under Schedule A. of the Empire Settlement Agreement came to an end in April, 1925, and only a few of such children, in respect of whom we considered we were committed, sailed at a later date, and Mary Dickson was not one of these.

If the Salvation Army took Mary Dickson for the purpose of sending her straight to her mother instead of placing her from their hostel, they deliberately misled us, and they may have done the same thing in many other cases.”

A further reply was received from the Director under date of September 28th, 1926, who stated that Mrs. George Dickson had been interviewed at Greenock and had stated that she knew of no agreement with the Salvation Army for the payment of Mary's passage to Canada.

Annexed hereto is a copy of a report, dated the 5th of November, 1926, from our Agent at Toronto who had been instructed to inquire further into this case.

The evidence before the Department which appeared to establish conclusively that Mary Dickson was required to repay the cost of her transportation to the Salvation Army was:—

(1) The statement of Mrs. Dickson when questioned by an officer of the Department on May 4th, 1926, to the effect that she expected to have to repay \$100 to the Salvation Army for Mary's transportation as she had come with that understanding.

(2) Mrs. Dickson's written statement dated August 24th, 1926, that Mary had got a loan of \$100 which she promised to refund and had signed a form regarding the same.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

(3) Mrs. George Dickson's statement that she had received letters from Mrs. Dickson saying the Salvation Army was asking for payments which she told them it was impossible to make at the time but would do so later.

(4) Mrs. Dickson's statement to an officer of this Department on November 5th, 1926 to the effect that—

- (a) When she paid a deposit of £1 on Mary's passage it was put down on the paper that the amount of the loan was over \$100 and Staff Captain Layne asked her if she would be willing to pay ten shillings a month back. She states she agreed to this.
- (b) When a Salvation Army Officer called after Christmas, 1925, she (Mrs. Dickson) asked if the officer had come for a payment. The officer replied that he had just called to see if Mary was in a proper home and working.
- (c) A Salvation Army Officer called late in October, 1926, to make a collection on the daughter Marion's loan and asked Mrs. Dickson if she had started to pay anything on Mary's loan.

On November 13th, 1926, cable advice from the Assistant Deputy Minister, who was then in London, indicated that a loan had been granted to Marion Dickson, a sister of Mary Dickson, and that the collection by the Army doubtless referred only to Marion.

The record of the Department shows that Mary Dickson joined her mother in Toronto and obtained factory work instead of taking household work as a ward of the Salvation Army.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, CANADA

46-50 ADELAIDE ST., E.

TORONTO, 2, ONTARIO, November 5, 1926

(Rush)

SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 3rd instant regarding the immigration to Canada of one, Mary Dickson; I have located Mrs. Dickson residing at 72 Shudell Ave., Toronto.

I had an interview with Mrs. Dickson, and as it was thought Mary could recollect the dates better, I interviewed both parties on the night of the 4th instant. I took a statement from Mrs. Dickson and she advises me that she called at the Salvation Army Offices on Hope Street, Glasgow, Scotland, about January, 1925; she does not know the name of the officer she interviewed, but she was advised they might be able to get her a loan, and that possibly they might be able to get her a loan without the necessity of a refund for her daughter Mary Dickson. She states she did not bother any more about the matter until the 1st of October, 1925, when she was booking her own passage at the Salvation Army Offices on Hope Street, Glasgow. At this time she spoke to the lady stenographer and asked her if she could get a free passage for her daughter Mary; the lady stenographer stated she had never heard anything about it; Mrs. Dickson says she had the interview of some ten months previous in mind. The lady stenographer advised Mrs. Dickson she had better see the Canadian Government Office; she went to our office on Hope Street and was advised there that they did not give free passages.

Mrs. Dickson then returned to the Salvation Army Offices and spoke to the lady stenographer again, advising her that they did not seem to know anything about free passages. She asked the lady stenographer if it would be possible for Mary to get an assisted passage, seeing as she could not get a free passage.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

The lady stenographer asked her Mary's age, what she was working at, and Mrs. Dickson told her that Mary was working in an office, and the lady stenographer said she would try to have Mary sail on the ss. *Doric*. Mrs. Dickson states she booked her own passage paying \$20, and that she deposited £1.0.0 on Mary's passage. She was advised that two photographs would be required; one for the Canadian Government, and one for the Salvation Army, also two character references; further that her papers had to be signed by a J.P. or a Minister. The papers she signed, Mrs. Dickson states, were of foolscap size, and when at the Hope Street office of the Salvation Army, they gave her some papers to get signed by Mary; these papers referred to her age, height, whether she was married or single, etc., also what her father died of.

It appears Staff Captain Layne was there at this time, and Mrs. Dickson states that it was put down on the paper that the amount of the loan was over \$100, and he asked her if she would be willing to pay ten shillings a month back; she states he agreed to this. Mrs. Dickson then received a letter from the Salvation Army to say that they were very sorry Mary could not go with her.

Mary Dickson states that the day before she left she was called to the Salvation Army Offices, Hope Street, Glasgow, and the stenographer asked her a number of questions; her name, address, and where she was going to; she told the stenographer she was going to 56 Milverton Blvd., Toronto; she was also asked what kind of work she would like and she answered a nurse maid; Mary states she wrote this herself, and on Monday she had to go to a doctor.

Mrs. Dickson states that when she was going on the tender to go on the ss. *Doric*, she was met by Staff Captain Spicer of the Salvation Army and he said "I have your daughter's papers back O.K., and she will be sailing on the 6th of November." Mrs. Dickson states that she kept in touch with the Salvation Army until Mary was in Toronto, and that her daughter Marion Dickson, who had come out under the auspices of the Salvation Army previously, went to the Toronto station; apparently she knew the officer who was looking after them through paying back her money; she states she told the officer Mary might as well go home to their place, and the officer asked her their address and she replied 36 Seymour Street, and allowed her to proceed.

Mrs. Dickson states the next she heard was a telephone call to see if Mary was quite all right, but that this was after Christmas; that about one month later she had a visit from a Salvation Army Officer, and she asked the Officer if she had come for a payment; the Officer replied that she had just called to see if Mary was in a proper home and if she was working.

It appears that Mary secured work with the T. Eaton Co., during the Christmas rush, and that after Christmas Mrs. Dickson took Mary to the Salvation Army where they secured her a position with a Mrs. Burns, 5 Somerset Ave., Toronto. It appears Mary got very homesick and wanted to go home every night; they believe she was there for three months. Mrs. Burns, it seems, required some one who would stay every night, and Mary then got a position with a Mrs. Layne whom she had made the acquaintance of in Eaton's; she undertook to look after this woman's child, and was allowed to go home every night; Mrs. Layne was employed with the T. Eaton Co. In August, this year, she secured a position with the Currie Neckwear Co., where she worked for two months, next securing a position, a permanent one, with the Benjamin Electric Mfg., Co., in their factory, where she is at present employed.

Mrs. Dickson states further that a Salvation Army Officer called again on her when she had just been out at a day's work, and she found her card; that the Salvation Army Officer called a week ago to make a collection on Marion's loan, and she asked her if she had started to pay anything on Mary's loan, and Mrs. Dickson replied, not yet. She has had no letters from the Salvation Army, and she claims to have no letters of any kind. Mrs. Dickson advises me that the stenographer at the Hope Street office of the Salvation Army, Glasgow, told

her, "You will understand that when we emigrate Mary to Canada she will be under the Army's charge, and even if she goes on the same boat, she will be under the Army's charge until she is eighteen years of age"; further that when she arrived in Toronto she might be sent out of Toronto; she claims that as she was getting the loan for Mary and had the money to pay back, she thought she could claim her after her arrival, and that it was made quite clear by the Army that Mary was under their charge until she was eighteen years of age.

Mrs. Dickson had in her mind the idea that if she could get Mary out to Canada she could claim her; she is quite clear in the matter that she was to repay to the Army Mary's loan, and she states "there is no doubt about it"; she was prepared to agree to anything they would ask in order to get Mary out to Canada, and she denies that there was any agreement, directly or indirectly, that Mary was to be brought out to be delivered to her.

From Mrs. Dickson's statement it would appear that she had in mind, getting Mary out to Canada and repay the loan; but the only reference to the loan since Mary arrived was when the Salvation Army officer inquired a week ago as to whether she had started to repay Mary's loan as yet. (Mrs. Dickson advises me that she thinks that Staff Captain Spicer of the Salvation Army may have had the idea that she was going to meet Mary; but the only reason she can give for this is her persistency and willingness to agree to anything that might be suggested.)

It would appear to be a case where Mrs. Dickson was emigrating to Canada; she had three children and she did not wish to leave them with her son who was recently married, and she had in mind securing Mary's emigration to Canada,—and was, therefore, agreeable to signing anything. It would appear that the Salvation Army had advised Mrs. Dickson pretty definitely that Mary was to be in their charge until she was eighteen years of age, and Mrs. Dickson declares that there was no suggestion by anybody that Mary was to be brought out here and handed over to her, and that she definitely understood that Mary was to be a ward of the Army until she was eighteen years of age.

It would appear that the Salvation Army office at Toronto and the Army Officers in Toronto have been very lax in looking after this young woman, who was brought out as a ward, and paid for by the Department.

I would suggest that we endeavour to secure any papers Mrs. Dickson might have signed at the Salvation Army Office, Hope Street, Glasgow; you will note that this young woman is not working as a domestic and would appear to be in full charge of the mother; further that the only reference to payments was a week ago when the Army Collector asked if she had started to pay as yet on Mary's loan.

Your obedient servant,

JAS. C. MITCHELL,

Dominion Immigration Agent.

W. J. EGAN, Esq.,

Deputy Minister of Immigration and Colonization,

Ottawa, Ontario.

The WITNESS: The next I wish to submit to the Committee for their consideration is a review of the women's settlement, making some reference to the hostels and people which were handled last year.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Give us a short resume of that.

The WITNESS: It really describes the formation of the women's branch and the functions of the Department, where and how they operate, the different hostels we operate through on account of provincial and federal co-operation in all cases but two, and the names of the national organizations working in co-operation with the departmental officials in connection with the settlement of women.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Are they our own hostels?—A. That I have covered in some data in connection with the Salvation Army. I go to show the whole contribution.

Q. I think we should have a resume of the Salvation Army. What we want to know is, what the agreements are?—A. The Canadian Women's hostels—giving you the figures, Colonel Ralston—have been established in the provinces to which houseworkers seeking domestic employment are destined: (Reads):—

CANADIAN WOMEN'S HOSTELS

Canadian Women's Hostels have been established in Provinces to which house workers, seeking domestic employment, are destined. These hostels are non-denominational and receive grants from the Dominion Government and in most cases they also receive grants from the Provincial Governments. Each hostel is under the management of a local committee who appoint a President, Treasurer and Secretary, e.g., Montreal—

Committee

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Honorary President, | 7. I.O.D.E., |
| 2. " Treasurer, | 8. Lutherans, |
| 3. " Secretary, | 9. Montreal Women's Club, |
| Representatives of the— | 10. Presbyterian Church, |
| 4. Baptist Church, | 11. United Church, |
| 5. Catholic Women's League, | 12. Y.M.C.A., |
| 6. Church of England, | 13. National Council of Women. |

These hostels received the following grants during 1927-28 from the Dominion and Provincial Governments,—

Hostel	Federal Grant		Provincial Grant	
	\$	cts.	\$	cts.
Halifax.....	350	00		
St. John.....	500	00		
Montreal.....	5,000	00		
Toronto.....	2,000	00	5,000	00
Winnipeg.....	750	00	1,500	00
Regina.....	1,000	00	750	00
Calgary.....	2,500	00	1,000	00
Vancouver.....	350	00		

These hostels also derive revenue for board and lodging from house workers who have already received the free accommodation and who may subsequently require temporary accommodation.

In addition the Dominion Government pays each hostel east of Manitoba the sum of \$1.50 for the accommodation of each house worker for twenty-four hours, and each hostel west of Ontario receives the sum of \$3 for the accommodation of each house worker for forty-eight hours.

The Department also pays the above per diem allowance for the accommodation of houseworkers in the following Institutions,—

Province	City	Institution
Nova Scotia.....	Halifax.....	Sisters of Service Hostel.
New Brunswick.....	St. John.....	Rosary Hall Hostel.
Quebec.....	Montreal.....	Catholic Women's League Hostel.
Ontario.....	Ottawa.....	Y.W.C.A.
Ontario.....	Ottawa.....	King's Daughters Guild.
Ontario.....	Ottawa.....	Rosary Hall Hostel.
Ontario.....	Toronto.....	Catholic Women's League Hostel.
Ontario.....	London.....	Y.W.C.A.
Ontario.....	Hamilton.....	Y.W.C.A.
Manitoba.....	Winnipeg.....	Catholic Women's League Hostel.
Alberta.....	Edmonton.....	Y.W.C.A.
Alberta.....	Edmonton.....	Rosary Hall.
British Columbia.....	Vancouver.....	Y.W.C.A.
British Columbia.....	Vancouver.....	Queen Mary's Coronation Hostel.
British Columbia.....	Victoria.....	Y.W.C.A.
British Columbia.....	Victoria.....	Joyce Hostel.

The Immigration Branch of the Salvation Army has been offered the same per diem allowance that is paid to the above institutions.

STATEMENT OF AMOUNTS PAID BY THE DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION TO THE SALVATION ARMY FOR A PERIOD OF TWENTY-THREE YEARS FROM THE FISCAL YEAR OF 1904-05

Fiscal Year	Grants		Bonuses		Sundries		Total	
	\$	cts.	\$	cts.	\$	cts.	\$	cts.
1904-05.....			3,947	57			3,947	57
1905-06.....	1,500	00	8,124	90	267	94	9,892	84
1906-07.....	500	00	9,052	50	890	60	10,443	10
1907-08.....	24,560	01	11,896	58			36,456	59
1908-09.....	24,166	67	2,634	00			26,800	67
1909-10.....	8,387	49	1,046	00			9,433	49
1910-11.....	15,516	64	11,011	97			26,528	61
1911-12.....	13,387	48	10,761	00			24,148	48
1912-13.....	17,645	86	8,929	40			26,575	26
1913-14.....	22,516	68	9,170	60	214	62	31,901	90
1914-15.....	21,516	67	3,145	90			24,662	57
1915-16.....	10,000	00	926	63			10,926	63
1916-17.....	7,500	00	157	30	597	87	8,255	17
1917-18.....	7,500	00			63	87	7,563	87
1918-19.....	7,500	00					7,500	00
1919-20.....	5,000	00					5,000	00
1920-21.....	15,000	00	274	67			15,274	67
1921-22.....	26,500	00	157	62	51	00	26,708	62
1922-23.....	26,500	00					26,500	00
1923-24.....	35,000	00					35,000	00
1924-25.....	25,000	00					25,000	00
1925-26.....	25,000	00					25,000	00
1926-27.....	25,000	00					25,000	00
	365,197	50	81,236	64	2,085	90	448,520	04

In addition to the above amounts, the Department has paid the Army for passage grants on account of children, the following amounts:—

1923-24.....	\$ 13,277	04
1924-25.....	23,612	97
1925-26.....	14,719	19
1926-27.....	9,919	48
	<u>\$ 61,528</u>	<u>68</u>

The Department also paid the underlisted amounts to the Salvation Army for transportation of class "A" children on account of British Government's share for which we obtained refund from that Government.

1923-24.....	\$	719 96
1924-25.....		20,422 54
1925-26.....		14,239 19
1926-27.....		8,838 50
	\$	<u>45,220 19</u>

Total paid to Salvation Army from April 1st, 1904, to March 31st, 1927,—
\$555,268.91.

NOTE.—These figures based on Auditor General's reports.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Mr. Egan, why is there a difference in the different provinces? In some places I notice there is no provincial grant at all and the federal grant covers the whole thing. Why is there any discrimination between the various provinces?—A. There is no discrimination on our part. If the provincial government will not make a grant we cannot help that.

Q. As I understand it, the work is carried on in the different provinces, but in some cases the Dominion Government pays for the whole thing?—A. Yes.

Q. And in other provinces they do not? In some provinces the Dominion Government is willing to assume the whole load. Why is it not assumed by the Dominion Government in all cases?—A. The purpose of the whole proposition was that it would be a provincial and federal co-operation, and Ontario and Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta have contributed. The amounts to the other provinces that do not contribute are not large because the movement is small; in British Columbia \$350 and in New Brunswick \$500. That is the total the federal Government subscribed to those provinces. I am mistaken to this extent, as to Quebec. Quebec does not subscribe but Montreal is a clearing house for thousands, I may say, each year, where they remain for a day or two, and therefore we feel that we must keep up the hostel there, but the Quebec Government has not seen its way to contribute. We have to keep up the hostel there.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. There are a number of persons passing through?—A. Yes, that is the way it is established, according to the work that they develop.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. In connection with these hostels I have heard complaints to this effect: In Saskatchewan the hostel is at one point and the domestic help coming to that point is distributed in the neighbourhood of the place where the hostel is, but in other portions of the province they do not receive the domestic help which they believe they require. How is the distribution made after the domestic help comes to a hostel?—A. It is made really most of the time through the provincial authorities. In the provinces that are not co-operating with their provincial officials, it is made through the medium of the local welfare societies looking after women and their placement.

Q. Just what function do these women's hostels perform?—A. They are clearing houses. First of all the girls go there and before they are sent to any private house there is a full report made on the home they are going to, then if perchance they are in difficulty with their employer, it is a medium for finding a new position. And if they are in town and want to rest for a day or two they use the hostel as a sort of clubhouse.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. In Saskatchewan the hostel is at Regina. Is the local committee there composed of people from that locality?—A. Yes, representing various provincial welfare societies.

Q. And they allocate any group of domestic help that comes in, to the various points?—A. According to the demands made previously on them from different centres.

Q. Complaint has been made by various people that they find it impossible to get the domestic help they require, at other points. That seems to be one of the objections that has been raised for a long time. I have been wondering whether or not the complaints were justified or not?—A. I think up to a certain point there must be some justification for the complaints, but it means establishing other hostels in other centres, if you want to overcome the largest part of the complaint. I have not heard anything as yet from any of the provincial officials as to complaints being in evidence with them. I am speaking now of the western provinces. I meet the officials from time to time and they have not submitted any complaints of that kind to me.

By Mr. Ross (Moose Jaw):

Q. In the province of Saskatchewan, the provincial government maintain agencies and would not these people work in very close co-operation with them?—A. They do. There is the closest co-operation between all these societies. I gave you an example of ten different welfare or church societies in Montreal, acting on the part of these societies in co-operation with the Department.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I think Mr. Ross refers to the provincial employment hostels.

The WITNESS: Yes, there is wholehearted co-operation in respect to these societies, and their requirements are also submitted to the provincial labour office.

By Mr. Ross (Moose Jaw):

Q. As a matter of fact it is pretty hard to get them. They cannot get a sufficient supply of domestic help. Have you anything to say about that?—A. That is a fairly universal complaint.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. If, for instance, there are two hundred required in Saskatchewan, are those allocated by the local committee?—A. Yes.

Q. So they could, if they so desire, allocate those arriving amongst the people they know best?—A. That is possible, but after all a local committee is formed from what I think is about as fair as you can find in this world. Most of them are people who devote their time to the welfare of others and I think they would look at that problem with some sense of proportion.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: In Saskatoon they complain that the Regina people get them all and they never get as far as Saskatoon.

The WITNESS: I admit that there must be something to that complaint, to a certain extent.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Would it not be possible to have this committee composed of representatives from various parts of the province in order that the needs of the whole province might be more adequately observed?—A. I am quite sure the Provincial Labour Bureau do look after that end of it. I will be glad to go into it in more detail and advise you, and I will suggest to Miss Burnham when she goes west on her next trip to look into it.

Q. Who appoints the local committee?—A. The local welfare institutions. They nominate their own president, vice-president and manager; and a com-

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

mittee, representative of each special society, act as directors, or a certain number of them. In Montreal, it is ten directors as well as the president and vice-president. The thing has been working to wonderful advantage up to now and this is the first I have heard of this complaint. It has never been submitted to me before. I can quite understand that it would come to you locally on account of your very large centres perhaps not getting all they require; but I think Regina is in the same position. It does not receive half the experienced domestic help it should have.

Q. That explains perhaps what I want. If Regina is not getting half what it requires, and there is a local committee there, they would be more familiar with the local complaints and would probably attend to them first. I have had many serious complaints along this line and it might possibly assist if the hostel were located in the central portion of Saskatchewan, and they might be more distributed through the province in that way?—A. You would have to influence the provincial government and not us. We are willing to do whatever the provincial government want in that respect.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I do not like to interrupt but I do not think you have touched the real difficulty of the situation in regard to domestic help. We get the women, but not the domestic help.

The WITNESS: That is quite right. I have not touched on that.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: The trouble is that the experience of the Department is this: the women come out as domestic help and in a month or two they have drifted into the city and are not to be found where they were expected to go at all.

The WITNESS: That is our general experience. I was answering more along the lines of location which I thought was what was asked.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: The western plains could take thousands of women of that kind, if they would come out and do the work, but we cannot get them. That is, we cannot get domestic help.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Will you instruct Miss Burnham to look into this problem that I have mentioned and see whether a reasonable solution can be arrived at?—A. I will submit it to the Saskatchewan authorities as it has been suggested to-day, and I will have Miss Burnham look into it as I have previously stated.

I would now like to submit to the Committee a memorandum in detail as to what constitutes the publicity work of the Department.

(The Chairman left the Chair which was assumed by Mr. Brown, M.P., as Acting Chairman).

Mr. DONNELLY: I do not see why this paper should not be submitted the same as others were this morning, and printed in the record. We can read the record.

The WITNESS: If I may be privileged to say so, I think those interested in this phase of our work will be able to get it in the printed form. I quite agree with the suggestion.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed to?

Carried.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The paper will be taken as read and printed in the record.

PUBLICITY

Immigration business is developed in the British Isles in the United States by our representatives in these countries. The origin of immigration business in both countries is advertising and publicity and exhibits at fairs or shows.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Our Agents in the British Isles also give lectures where prospects are established and business is also developed by booking agents.

The Department of Immigration and Colonization carries on publicity in those countries from which may be secured settlers of the type likely to succeed in Canada, and where such activities are regarded without disfavour by the national government. These conditions limit the field mainly to the British Isles and the United States of America. In some of the countries of North-western Europe a more favourable attitude toward Canadian publicity has recently been observed, but, generally speaking, these countries do not regard with favour any pronounced emigration activities by other lands.

The publicity work of the Department is carried on through a Publicity Branch at Ottawa; through the general organization of the Department in the British Isles and the United States, and, to a lesser degree, through its organization in Europe.

Every Immigration official in Canada outside of Ottawa is a news contributor. Items of interest touching every branch of agricultural development, successful individual settlement or any other items of news which are likely to be accepted for publicity purposes are forwarded by Immigration officials to the Director of Publicity who prepares and contributes the material to newspapers or farm journals outside of Canada.

There is a special service to 500 newspapers in the United States about twice a week, and a weekly bulletin of over one thousand circulation contributes news for the use of editors. This service also feeds certain newspapers printed in foreign languages.

A similar news service is also forwarded to our London Office where it is put into shape for circulation to the metropolitan, provincial and rural press in the British Isles.

The attitude of the Department with regard to its publicity is, that while Canada's attractions shall be vigorously presented, they must not be exaggerated, and the statements in every instance must be such as can be supported by actual facts. The charges sometimes heard that Canadian publicity is too optimistic when run to their source invariably disclose that the publicity complained of was not issued by the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

The more important avenues of publicity utilized by the Department are: newspaper and farm journal advertising; the preparation and distribution of news and feature articles; the preparation and distribution of booklets and other literature; illustrated lectures; the placing of exhibits of Canadian products at agricultural fairs; the maintenance of attractive show windows at strategic points, and special visits to Canada of editorial parties.

ADVERTISING

The purpose of the advertising and other publicity activities of the Department is to make known in other lands the opportunities which Canada affords to new settlers, and to make available to the better classes of prospective immigrants reliable information about the Dominion.

Advertising is carried in periodicals circulating in farm communities in the British Isles and the United States. It is confined mainly to the late autumn and winter months, this being the season in which farmers are most receptive to this kind of appeal. Its object is to give information about and create an interest in Canada as a field of opportunity for the classes to which the appeal is directed. The advertising invites enquiries for more detailed information and these enquiries, when received by the Department either at headquarters or at any of its agencies, are answered by letters covering the subject in some detail and accompanied by appropriate literature. In the course of an ordinary year the Department distributes between a million and a half and two million copies of its publications.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

The Department advertises in 47 papers in the United States. These include the leading farm papers of that country such as "Country Gentleman," "Successful Farming," "Farm and Fireside," "Farm Journal," "Farm Life," etc., and the leading farm papers in those States from which we are encouraging immigration.

The Department also advertises in 454 papers in Great Britain reaching the principal rural and farming populations of that country.

EXHIBITIONS.—UNITED STATES

Exhibits depicting the growth, progress, and resources of Canada, with special emphasis upon the country's agricultural possibilities, are an important feature of the work of making Canada known to other countries. These exhibits may vary in magnitude from the splendid presentation of Canada at the Wembley Exhibition to a portable stand at some agricultural fair in the British Isles or the United States. They are also a means of bringing the public of other countries and, in the case of agricultural fairs, particularly the farming classes, into direct contact with representatives of the Department.

SUMMARY

Agency	Good Prospects Established	Average Cost per Prospect for the Agency
		\$ cts.
Boston.....	49	38 82
Chicago.....	48	46 51
Columbus.....	12	103 83
Detroit.....	27	53 96
Fargo.....	264	13 50
Great Falls.....	18	30 42
Harrisburg.....	70	21 48
Indianapolis.....	66	45 26
Kansas City.....	24	101 10
Omaha.....	94	58 33
Portland.....	17	30 77
Spokane.....	64	15 85
St. Paul.....	182	11 42
Woonsocket.....	16	30 84

During the last fiscal year, the department was represented at 70 exhibitions in the United States. Our agents reported an aggregate attendance at the Canadian exhibits of 2,239,400 persons.

EXHIBITIONS.—UNITED KINGDOM

Exhibitions.—The usual exhibition work of the department was considerably interfered with during the season by the prolonged labour unrest, and a series of outbreaks of foot and mouth disease, which caused the cancellation of a large number of these fixtures. Nevertheless, it was found possible to have the department represented at 108 agricultural shows, the total attendance of which amounted to 986,186, of whom 215,586 visited the Canadian Government exhibits. At these fixtures 209,267 pieces of literature were distributed. Names of prospective settlers were obtained at these shows wherever possible, and the total prospects secured were as follows:—

Families	Single Men	Domestics
222	294	27

A new feature this year, which may be described as a sequel to the Wembley Exhibition, was a large number of Empire Displays, Empire Shopping Weeks, Empire Fairs, etc., to which we were able to send displays of Canadian produce,

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

although the department was not well equipped for this class of exhibit, owing to the demand being more for trade products, such as tinned salmon, bottled fruit, honey, butter, cheese, etc. Nevertheless, we sent displays and distributed literature. At four of the larger of these fixtures a complete Canadian exhibit was erected. The sum expended on exhibitions and exhibits was £2,198.9.0.

The objective of the Department's publicity—to excite an intelligent interest in Canada and to bring interested persons into direct contact with a representative of the Department. Whether that contact be established as the result of advertising, or of news matter distributed through the Press, or of lectures or exhibitions or any other of the many forms of publicity, the first objective has been accomplished when the enquirer is placed in contact with the departmental representative. He then becomes the subject of personal attention and, if he proves to be of the type likely to become a successful settler every co-operation is extended in supplying him with detailed information and in facilitating the migration of himself, his family and his effects to the Dominion.

The cumulative value of publicity is very generally recognized in the business world. Trade marks and slogans, popularized by advertising, are regarded as among the most valuable assets of many business enterprises. While it is impossible to place a specific value upon the cumulative effect of the Department's publicity, it is certain that it has done and is doing a great deal to make Canada better known in other lands, and that this increased knowledge is beneficial to Canada, not only in connection with her immigration work, but along many other lines as well. It may fairly be claimed that the publicity conducted by the Department has not only promoted immigration but has contributed to a better understanding with other countries and has been of value to every branch of Canadian industry.

The WITNESS: Then, I have something to submit in connection with the evidence given by Mr. George H. Corbett. (Reads):—

Mr. Geo. H. Corbett, Executive Secretary of the Society for the Protection of Women and Children, Montreal, referred to the case of Arthur Charlton and family having become public charges in Canada and no action being taken to effect deportation.

Departmental record shows that in September, 1925, the Society for the Protection of Women and Children made a complaint with regard to the said family. It was reported that Arthur Charlton and family arrived in Canada by the SS. "Doric" on July 11th, 1925. On October 10th the Deputy Minister's order was issued for the examination of this family in accordance with the provisions of Sections 40 and 42 of the Immigration Act. On October 19th 1925, Mr. Corbett, Executive Secretary of the Society referred to, wrote our Agent at Montreal as follows:—

"We wrote you in above connection on September 25th last.

On the 2nd inst. efforts to obtain a position for this man were successful. Charlton and his wife are now acting as janitor and janitress of the Auditorium Building, Ontario St. West, for which they receive \$20 per week, and all the usual perquisites.

I have your letter on the 16th inst. and under the circumstances am asking you to suspend examination. Both the Charltons seem very anxious to make a go of their position but owing to the very restricted accommodation, they may find it difficult to continue. We are, however, endeavouring to make arrangements for the care of the two younger children in an institution. As the parents will be able to pay the moderate charges entailed, these children will not be subjects of application to the Quebec Public Charities list.

If, for any reason, Charlton is not amenable to your rules in the future, I will take the matter up with you at the time."

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

On the above letter being transmitted to the Department, the Division Commissioner advised our Agent at Montreal that in view of the statement of the Society for the Protection of Women and Children no further action was to be taken unless further complaint was made. No further complaint has been received to date.

May 9th, 1928.

That is, no further complaint until he spoke at this meeting. What I have read explains why the deportation was deferred; it was at the request of the society.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. On that deportation question, Mr. Egan, what is necessary before a man is deported? What is the procedure?—A. If he is an illegal entry into the country, or is becoming a public charge any time within five years, which must be a full five years—if perchance he has been in hospital for four months, then he must serve as a full fledged citizen of five years and four months before he is free, that is has acquired a domicile. We never take any action in respect to public charges unless the municipalities report to us the fact that the man is a public charge.

Q. Then, do you investigate the case, or do you take their word for it?—A. Oh, no, we do not take their word for it; we send our officers and we have a Board on them before we order the deportation. That also applies, of course, to notification from penal institutions as to criminals et cetera.

I should now like to refer to a case mentioned by Canon Burd on page 280 of his evidence. (Reads):—

7th May 1928.

Memorandum

Canon Burd on page 280 of his evidence, no. 11, Thursday, April 26, 1928, referred to the case of a Mr. Sparrow whose application was rejected as unsuitable under the 3,000 Family Scheme. The evidence showed that Mr. Sparrow had paid his own passage to Canada, that he was employed on a farm near Prince Albert and that his services were acceptable. It would further appear that his two boys are now employed on a farm in Ontario.

We cabled the Director of Emigration in London for an explanation and the following cable reply has been received:—

Cables exchanged Sparrow could not qualify under Family Scheme lacking farming experience stop made no application for reduced rate for himself to our agent stop overseas refuses grant reduced rate men proceeding Canada advance families therefore Sparrow could not obtain reduced transportation.

Under date of the 30th ultimo we cabled our London Office as follows:—

Yours thirtieth forward original application and all case papers regarding George W. Sparrow.
and received the following reply:—

Mailing original complete file George Sparrow case registered mail to-day.

Under date of the 9th of January 1928 we received and accepted the nomination of Mrs Emily Sparrow and her two children who were destined to Prince Albert. On the 17th of February 1928 we received notification that Mrs. Sparrow and her two children would sail by the SS. *Andania* on the 24th of March, 1928.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Is that the same case where the man was not physically fit?—A. Yes, the man Sparrow with the bad eye. I have given you the evidence as against the Canon's complaint that we had not accepted the man. It was impossible to accept him.

For the information of the Committee, I have a memorandum here which I might read. (Reading):—

7th May, 1928.

In replying to a question by Mr. Cahan on page 239 No. 10, Wednesday, April 25, 1928, Mr. E. W. Beatty pointed out that there was one aspect of the situation which was sometimes overlooked and that was the great number of privately owned lands in the West. Mr. Beatty's evidence on this point reads in part as follows:—

I have always felt that if the Government looks with favour upon greater assistance there must be a method found of bringing in to such a scheme these many, many acres of privately owned land in the three Prairie Provinces, and if the Government assists in the settlement of these lands, then the advances made by the Government should be prior to any existing charge against that land. No effective scheme has been worked out, because it can only be done by agreement between all of the thousands of owners of private lands who would come in to one great land selling pool. I have never heard that one has been attempted, and it would have to be a part of the government policy, and the Government itself perhaps is the only influence sufficiently strong to bring that about. These lands should be made available on terms to which the Government itself would agree were fair to the incoming settler. That has never been approached in this country, so far as I know, and I have always thought it was one of our greatest difficulties.

In this connection I shall read a letter dated the 22nd of June, 1926, which I wrote to John Appleton, Esq., Secretary, The Dominion Mortgage & Investments Association, Canada Life Bldg., Bay St., Toronto, Ontario, containing certain proposals for the colonization or settlement of improved farms and lands owned or controlled by the companies which comprise the Dominion Mortgage and Investment Association:—

OTTAWA, CANADA, 22nd June, 1926.

DEAR SIR,—Referring to our conference of the 8th instant, I have now much pleasure in submitting, as requested by Mr. G. H. Smith, a memorandum covering the suggestions which I made regarding colonization schemes which would involve the settlement of approximately 2,000 families annually on farms in Canada.

The proposals embodied in the enclosed memorandum are made without prejudice and for the purpose of determining whether it is possible to formulate a colonization scheme on a co-operative basis.

These proposals are of course applicable to improved farms and lands owned or controlled by the companies which comprise the Dominion Mortgage and Investments Association.

If it is possible to formulate a scheme for British settlement I shall then submit another memorandum regarding the settlement of continentals.

I shall be glad to hear further from you regarding these proposals.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) W. J. EGAN.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

The Secretary of the Dominion Mortgage and Investments Association replied on the 8th of July 1926 and stated that the suggestions would be considered at a meeting of the Executive. Another letter dated the 8th of December, 1926 was received from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Association who stated that it was intended to discuss this matter fully at Edmonton in September but pressure of other business had interfered and that it was found necessary to refer the matter back to the Executive.

I quote the following extract which appears on page 15 of the Year Book 1927 of the Dominion Mortgage and Investments Association and Affiliated Associations:—

LAND SETTLEMENT AND COLONIZATION

This question has from time to time received the attention of your Executive. Each member company was asked, in July, 1926, to suggest practical means of bringing unoccupied lands under remunerative cultivation. A great variety of opinions were received and these were remitted to a Special Committee for consideration. The personnel of this Committee is as follows: Messrs. J. C. Breckenridge, C. S. Macdonald, E. M. Saunders, George H. Smith, W. G. Watson, J. F. Weston and G. B. Woods.

The opinion of the Special Committee was that the most practical step would be to discuss the problem with the Minister of Immigration with a view to determining in what respects the lending organizations could advantageously identify themselves with some general policy. With that end in view it was thought best to have the Minister of Immigration speak directly to the members and, also, to have brought directly to the attention of the members the views of some of the more active colonization organizations.

One of the results of this decision is that the Hon. Mr. Forke is to be with us at this meeting.

No further reply has been received.

My purpose in submitting this is to show that we have made an endeavour along these lines.

Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. What is the date of the letter?—A. The date of the letter is the 22nd of June, 1926.

Q. June, 1926?—A. Yes, sir. Then we go on with the proposals. Shall I submit this for your consideration without reading any further?

Agreed to.

(Documents filed.)

Memorandum

LAND SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS

1. The proposals for any land settlement or colonization scheme for the settlement of British families would involve co-operation with British and Dominion Governments under the provisions of the Empire Settlement Act of 1922.

2. The primary requirements for any colonization scheme are,—
- (a) The number of improved farms available and suitable for the settlement of British families.
 - (b) The prices and terms upon which such farms can be purchased by settlers.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

(c) What arrangements can be made with the British Government for an advance on account of stock and equipment.

3. The basis of co-operation may therefore be summarized as follows:—

(a) That the Land and Mortgage Companies furnish a list of the farms suitable for British families. This list should contain the following information:—

(i) Area of each farm, acreage under cultivation, area of waste land, or land unfit for cultivation, also area of swamp, stony and bush land.

(ii) Description of land, nature and quality of soil.

(iii) Improvements,—description of house and other farm buildings, when built and state of repairs, fences, roads, wells, etc.

(iv) Distance from railway and name of nearest station, markets, churches and schools.

(v) Total amount of original mortgage and amount now outstanding, excluding interest and taxes.

(vi) Interest accrued.

(vii) Taxes.

(viii) Present assessed value.

N.B.—Farms suitable for British settlement should be within reasonable distance of other British settlers and not in any foreign settlement, should consist of reasonably good land and buildings and not far removed from railways, churches, schools, etc.

(b) The Department is prepared to negotiate with the Oversea Settlement Office for an advance on account of stock and equipment for each settler.

(c) The Department of Immigration and Colonization of the Government of Canada is prepared to,—

(i) Undertake recruiting and selection in the United Kingdom.

(ii) Share with the British Government the cost of transportation by loan or grant to immigrant.

(iii) Undertake placement and supervision.

Supervision may be defined as follows: After a family has been placed on a farm, officials of the Department will obtain employment for adult members on farms in the vicinity so that they may gain local farming experience. Officials will also watch the progress of and advise new settlers until they are well established on their own farms.

4. Improved farms to be inspected and valued by officials of the Land Settlement Branch of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

5. The advisability of constituting a Settlement Board to determine the suitability and prices of farms.

6. Loans to be repaid in fifteen equal instalments with interest at five per cent per annum.

7. The head of each family should have at least twenty-five pounds after arrival at destination.

8. Any passage loans to be repaid within two years.

9. During the first two years the settler shall not be called upon to pay anything on account of purchase price or interest.

10. The settler to pay taxes from the date upon which he signs the Agreement of Sale.

11. Provision for an option on all farms for settlement.

I have here a memorandum in regard to the evidence given by the Rev. Canon Vernon, and I have requested Colonel Rattray to submit a memorandum pointing out to him what the Canon had submitted to me in reference to the 3,000 family scheme. This memorandum reads as follows (Reading):—

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION,
CANADA

LAND SETTLEMENT BRANCH

OTTAWA, May 8, 1928.

Memorandum

Mr. Egan

With reference to Reverend Canon Vernon's evidence before the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

In report of evidence (No. 12, page 304) Canon Vernon says:—

Perhaps the greatest weakness of the Three-Thousand-Family-Settlement Scheme lay in the fact that the farms used were mainly those turned back to the Government by soldier settlers. The Government had what looked like a big problem, with a lot of farms on their hands. Sometimes the farms were turned back because the settler would not or could not make good; many times because the farms themselves were poor. . . . I do not think people have been intentionally put on poor land, but I think it is a big mistake to let people go on poor land without some warning from some government representative that this farm is a farm perhaps in a dry belt where you get good crops one year and then go five years without a crop, and just as you are ready to dig out along comes another crop, and you become encouraged to carry on a little more. Many of these settlers have been placed on farms which are absolutely impossible as a means of making a livelihood.

Again on page 308, Mr. Arthurs questions Canon Vernon:—

You advocate a land survey and you give an instance of land taken back from soldier settlers, some of which land was not really good land and on which it was not advisable to place families.—

Answer: Yes.

In reply to the statement of Canon Vernon:—

1. The farms which reverted to the Board from soldier settlers were carefully appraised and only those which it was felt offered a reasonable chance of success to a British family were used for the Three-Thousand-Family Scheme.

2. The farms were classified according to their general character, and in all cases where any apparent obstacles to success existed, the families were informed of such so that as far as possible they knew before sailing the general nature of the property allocated to them and the particular problems that would have to be met. While families were placed in some cases on farms which required clearing, cleaning up, etc., no farms were assigned in so-called dry districts or in districts which presented really difficult obstacles.

3. Of the 2,669 families which had arrived up till March 31, 1928, 259 withdrew after being established, many of them for reasons which had nothing to do with the character of the land. They came out with the evident intention of taking up farming under the scheme, but a number of them decided to purchase farms entirely on their own account, withdrawing from the scheme.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Reports from settlers under this scheme indicate that in most cases they are making good progress and the Board is satisfied that they are going to succeed. During the visit to Canada of the Right Hon. the Earl of Clarendon, Chairman of the Overseas Settlement Committee, in 1926, he drove over 6,000 miles in all parts of Canada and inspected the operations of 200 British families settled under the scheme. His report stated the opinion that "the Three-Thousand-Family Scheme promises to become the most successful effort in colonization undertaken by any Government in modern times."

Superintendent.

W. J. EGAN, Esq.,
Deputy Minister, Department of Immigration and Colonization,
Ottawa.

I have just one or two more for the information of the Committee. We have heard evidence here in reference to our system of having more than one reference for the applicant, requiring two, while Australia requires only one. Let me read the official document from the Overseas Settlement, that is, the document in connection with this, approved by Australia. This is the system under which they work; it is more for your information than anything else. (Reading):—

AUSTRALIA

REFERENCE REQUIRED IN CONNECTION WITH PASSAGE ASSISTANCE

For the information of the Committee I beg to quote from instructions issued in reference to this question in connection with Australia Schemes.

Section 52 of these instructions reads:—

"The Australian Authorities require at least two separate original references from responsible persons vouching for the applicant's character to be produced by each applicant (see paras. 77 (2), and 81 (3))."

Section 77 s.s. (2) of the instructions reads:—

"The attention of the applicant must be called to the necessity of his *obtaining two references* from persons of the classes specified on the form."

While Section 80 s.s. (3) reads:—

"O.E.B. 19 should not be used, but the attention of the applicant should be specially directed to the requirements of the Australian Authorities that *at least two original references* (copies not acceptable) from responsible persons as to character, experience (if any) and suitability for domestic or other work, must be obtained and attached to the completed form in support of the application. In the case of women covered by para. 107 (4) (c), at least two references must testify to the applicant's capacity for domestic work."

The hand-book for men contemplating Oversea settlement and published by the Oversea Settlement Board, revised to January 1, 1928, states:—

"These forms should be returned, when completed, accompanied by two original references to the office from which they were received."

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Our recommendation is practically the same?—A. It is practically the same. It was said that Australia required only one. That is why I submit this for your information.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Q. It is not necessary to have a signature or a recommendation from the authorities?—A. No; we do not say his last employer—which does not necessarily mean his present employer.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. I take it then that the evidence given before in that regard was not accurate?—A. I am afraid they were stating what they had heard rather than what they knew.

Q. You are quoting now from the Overseas Settlement Board?—A. I am quoting from the Overseas Settlement Board for Australia. It is the Empire Settlement Act, dividing it up, and this is an extract from the Australian end of it.

By. Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. One of the references would be from his last employer?—A. His last employer does not mean his present employer.

Q. His present employer would not be his last employer?—A. He cannot be, until he has left him. He will accept this man's reference, but it does not necessarily call that his present employer. If he had never had any other employer, I presume he would have to submit his name. If he has not left him, he is not his last employer.

Q. I do not agree with you.—A. That is not my interpretation of it. I am speaking now of our practice. We do not insist upon the present employer submitting a reference. It is to avoid that, in case he gets into difficulties with his present employer.

Q. That is exactly the point. I can see how an intending emigrant could get into difficulties by going to the man for whom he is working and asking for a reference. His employer might ask "Why do you want a reference?" He would reply, "I am going to Canada." The employer might then say, "In that case, I will look around and get somebody else."

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. In this Committee there is a difference of opinion upon that word, and I suggest that that might be clarified in future regulations.—A. Quite right. Now, in reference to the examinations and the distances, a good deal of evidence was given in connection with Canada requiring people to travel a certain distance. I have here the instructions of the Overseas Settlement Board in connection with the Australian movement, which read as follows:—(Reading):—

INTERVIEWS FOR APPLICANTS IN CONNECTION WITH MOVEMENT
FOR AUSTRALIA

The following are the official instructions:—

In order that recommended applicants may be conveniently interviewed by representatives of the Australian Government, interviews are held at more or less regular intervals in the following centres:—

South-Eastern division—London.

South-Western Division—Bristol. Gloucester.

Midlands Division—Birmingham, Leicester, Nottingham, Wolverhampton.

North-Eastern Division—Newcastle, Sunderland, Middlebrough, Leeds, Sheffield, Bradford.

North-Western Division—Manchester, Liverpool.

Scotland Division—Glasgow, Edinburgh, Dundee, Aberdeen.

Wales Division—Cardiff, Newport, Swansea.

The Area covered by each interviewing centre is not the Exchange area only, but the district comprised within a ten-mile radius of the "Interview Exchange" including the areas of all other Exchanges and Branch Offices within that radius.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

You will thus see that Australia does not carry on, and of necessity cannot carry on, without their prospective immigrants meeting at a given centre, which centre is always the recognized British labour bureau for a given district and which covers a radius of ten miles of travel. You will have already noted from the evidence given that Canada covers more directly at certain points and that we have, all told, for interviewing in connection with society and land settlement work 42 officers which speaks for itself in so far as an endeavour to meet the convenience of the people in the British Isles is concerned.

I am putting this in for general information only.

That is all I have to submit, gentlemen, unless you have some questions to ask me.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Brown): Are there any questions anyone wishes to ask of Mr. Egan?

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Just for information, Mr. Egan, I see on page 54 of your Annual Report for 1927 a report by Exhibition Commissioner, Mr. J. O. Turcotte, of Canada's exhibit in New Zealand. Do we get any settlers from New Zealand?—A. No.

Q. What is the object of this man making a report and holding an exhibition under Immigration in New Zealand?—A. Mr. Turcotte was the Commissioner of Immigration, and the Canadian Government decided to co-operate in their exhibition in Dunedin, New Zealand, the request coming from New Zealand, not from the New Zealand Government, but the request had the approval of the New Zealand Government. The Government decided to exhibit there. It was really more than an industrial exhibit, a foods' exhibit, and what might be termed a general exhibit. He was loaned for this particular work, and carried on that particular work. I have not got the details in mind very clear, but that was his object in going there, the same as the exhibition at San Francisco.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. There was also an exhibition at Ottawa?—A. He took charge of that, and we heard of the result, if we did not see it.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. I was under the impression that it was more under the Department of Trade and Commerce and not the Immigration Department?—A. There was a separate vote in the estimates for this particular exhibition. I have forgotten the amount now.

Q. What are the restrictions in regard to literacy?—A. They must be literate. We do make an exception now and then, depending upon the conditions surrounding them, but they are required to be literate.

Q. On page 30 they give a table showing the number of illiterates, and, there were something over 700 last year?—A. 700 illiterates, more particularly after a war condition such as we had. You will often find now a boy of 10 or 12, or very often continental families, and even others, where the wife or the mother of the family is not literate, and the 700 includes all of those. Exceptions have been made in all these cases, but they have to be submitted to us.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. It was to be submitted to you?—A. It has to be submitted to us. It would not be done otherwise.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. We are nearing the close of this investigation. In considering the fact that our immigration policy has been such a failure—

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Hear, hear!

Mr. MCGIBBON: I say that advisedly.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I said hear, hear!

Mr. MCGIBBON: Can you give us any ideas for the future? I notice the Hon. Mr. Forke's sarcastic way. If I were the Minister of Immigration, and could not show any better results that we have heard of here, I would be ashamed of it. We used to get 300,000 or 400,000 people ten years ago; now we are getting less than one hundred thousand.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: We got more than 100,000.

Mr. MCGIBBON: Yes, such as they were. With our forests, and with our industries, with the advertisements we got in the war, there is no question at all but that Canada was pictured on the battlefields as a land flowing with milk and honey. That was because our soldiers were paid so much more; they were paid \$1.10 per day, while others were paid about 25 cents or less.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Mr. Egan, looking to the future, with which we are concerned, can you give us any light as to how to improve the situation?—A. As a matter of policy, I shall have to leave that to the Government to develop.

Q. But we have to make a report?—A. I am prepared to answer any specific questions. I would be prepared to argue with you on your first statement, that the policy was not successful. If you are submitting that Canada should be absorbing 400,000 people to-day, irrespective of continental and other world conditions, I am prepared to discuss that with you, and I think I could convince you of the difficulties that we see, and that your idea of 400,000 is not a healthy one for Canada, particularly if you have to go to the continent and bring in that many, which is being objected to so seriously, with 60,000 people from the continent or less.

Q. I am not asking that question. That has nothing to do with it. You are the man in charge and I am asking if you can give us any light on how to improve the immigration policy for the future. This country has to have people; there is no question about that. It is the very life blood of our existence, and we have to get British or American stock if we can get them, or reclaim the people who are out of the country, if we can get them.—A. That is the very task we are on.

Q. Can you give us any light on it?—A. It was laid down at the beginning of this conference that I was not to submit anything in the shape of policy in my talks or discussion, and I propose to stand on that unless there is some direct question from you with reference to any part. When it comes to developing anything in the way of policy, in view of the fact that the Committee is here to make suggestion as to policy after hearing the evidence—

Mr. MCGIBBON: Nearly every witness has given us his idea of what would help the situation.

The WITNESS: I think you mentioned "the man in charge". If you read the Act and the duties of the Deputy you will notice that it is "to advise his Minister when called upon." I ask you to look at it from this point of view. It is possible, having had five or six Ministers, that I have not agreed with some of them; it is possible that I have had ideas which have not been carried out. I am sure you would not want me to start propounding anything that has gone on between us and I cannot develop anything without that picture being in evidence.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

Mr. McGIBBON: I thought you might give us some light as to how to improve the immigration condition.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Mr. Egan, if a Canadian goes to the Old Country for a holiday and comes back, what must he do to get back?—A. You mean a Canadian born?

Q. Myself, for instance. Supposing I go to the Old Country for a holiday. Must I do anything before coming back?—A. Buy a ticket. When you go to purchase your ticket the transportation company will require you to fill out a certain form.

Q. What is that form?—A. It is the manifest of the steamer.

Q. Have you a copy of it?—A. No, I am afraid not. I had it for many days with me, but I am afraid I have not got it now.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The Secretary says it is in the record.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Have you finished the answer to my question?—A. There are some 25 or 26 questions on the form which are required for the statistics of the country. A Canadian of British birth having gone back and remained there for six months or a year must answer many more questions than the Canadian born. It is done by every citizen of every country under the same circumstances. The manifest form must be filled out when going into the United Kingdom. I may say that it sometimes appears difficult to returning Canadians. So much depends on the ticket seller and on his rush at that particular moment, because I have seen many of them advised in such a way that inside of three minutes they had gone through the form and filled out that which was required of them. If it is left as a mystery it seems like a burden. Very often they are filled out on board ship, but for the convenience of the staff on board the ship the forms are generally filled out before the ship sails. A Canadian born would fill out nine only of these questions.

Q. On what page of the record does that appear?—A. Pages 609 and following.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Mr. Egan, may I state a case to find out whether I am correct or not? John Brown, we will say, emigrates from England or Scotland to come on the land in Canada as a farm worker. He gets employment here and the time arrives when he feels he can bring out his family under assisted passage.—A. If he is a farmer, yes.

Q. Now, John Smith comes out to Canada and gets employment otherwise than on the land. He is a workman, we will say, in a factory. He establishes himself here in Canada and is in a position to bring his wife and family out. Can he bring his family out under reduced passage?—A. No. If he is in difficulties there is a society which is now part and parcel of the Overseas Settlement Board for the assistance of such families, by loaning them money and sometimes contributing toward the fare.

Q. Quite a number of foreigners from continental Europe come into Canada by way of the United States? Is that correct?—A. No, very few.

Q. There are some?—A. There are some, yes.

Q. If an immigrant comes from the United States do we not accept the medical certificate of the United States officers?—A. You mean via an American port?

Q. Yes. An immigrant coming into Canada—what medical examination would he have to pass?—A. Via the United States?

Q. Yes.—A. He would have to be vised by the Canadian officer before he leaves the Continent—

Q. No, I am referring to any person coming into Canada with the intention of settling in Canada. Supposing they are American citizens?—A. No medical examination along the American border.

Q. None whatever?—A. If the civil officer examining feels there is necessity, he immediately calls a doctor in that particular district.

Q. Otherwise there is no medical examination for immigrants coming in from the United States, whether they are native born or naturalized Americans?—A. None.

Q. And if they came by way of the United States from continental Europe—
A. That must be examined on the Continent.

Q. But no examination at the border?—A. No.

Q. They accept the examination made on the Continent of Europe?—A. By a Canadian doctor, which is registered on his passport. He must have that passport with all the facts stated on it before he would be admitted at the border. As a matter of fact he would have considerable difficulty since the quota regulations have come in, of doing anything of that kind.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. In reference to what Mr. Glen was asking: If a Canadian going over to Britain from here had a passport good, we will say, for two or three years, does he have to fill out this form just the same?—A. He would have to fill out the nine questions, and if he did that and referred to his passport number, he would have no difficulty whatsoever.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. The British born would also have a passport and have a large number of questions to answer?—A. Yes, because he would have to give the date when he first came to Canada. My procedure is to submit my passport and ticket and any information I have, and then I come back and everything is filled out for me, —the manifest form—and I look that over and I check it back with my knowledge of the facts and sign it at the bottom. It has happened every time I have been over since I first went over thirty-five years ago.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. This morning Mr. Fansher brought up a case of a man out west who went to a hospital there and was a charge on the municipality to the extent of several hundred dollars, to which the municipality very naturally objected. That brings to my mind the case of the McGran family, with which you are probably acquainted, which were brought out by Father McDonell for the Clan Donald settlement, and one man named Watson spent considerable money in providing relief for that family, to the extent of over \$600, and so far as I can tell from the correspondence which I have in my room the colony, or those in charge of the colony, seemed to think that the responsibility for taking care of that family rested with the Government, and I gather that the Government felt that the responsibility rested upon the organization which brought them out. As a matter of fact, private individuals were providing relief which it does seem to me should have been provided either by the organization bringing this family out or by the Government. Now, upon whom should the responsibility rest? It seems to me there was some laxity in the examination of this family by the doctor over in Ireland, a Canadian doctor—A. No, it was a roster doctor.

Q. —because five of the family were in hospital within a year after they came to Canada for treatment, and when you think of a child ten years of age weighing only thirty pounds, and the doctor reporting the worst case of adenoids he ever saw and one child with miasma, with its eyes turned right in so he could not see out of them at all, I wonder how in the world that family was ever induced

to come here. The correspondence shows the family was visited by the head of the organization himself. What I want to get at is upon whom does the responsibility for that properly rest? Somebody neglected that family.—A. After arrival. Our contention is that the Scottish Immigration Aid Society was responsible for that family. You must remember that the mother died shortly after the arrival of the family in Canada.

Q. And her husband claims she practically died of neglect.—A. I brought the file up here for the Committee's benefit. The stand we took right along was that the Society was responsible, and they have assumed the responsibility. I have never heard of any \$600 expenditure; I heard of some \$60. I understand now that the family is comfortably settled—

Q. That must be recently?—A. Three weeks or a month.

Q. The responsibility rested on them and not with the Government?—A. As far as these people were concerned, because they were brought in under those particular auspices for settlement.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I made a ruling in connection with that family—I do not know whether it was taken advantage of—In regard to a grant they were supposed to get.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: If my information is correct that organization has over 1,100 acres of land, which they get for a dollar a year. Not a dollar an acre, but one dollar a year for the whole location.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. In reference to the case I cited this morning, is there any way in attaching responsibility to a railway company for bringing in people of that sort and, I might say, dumping them on a community?—A. There is only one way and that is to restrict their efforts if they do too much of it.

Q. But after it is done there is no way of attaching responsibility to them for it?—A. Where it is a clear-cut responsibility of their's, they do respond very fairly towards taking charge and returning them.

Q. They have returned some, have they?—A. Yes, they have in some cases. Only quite recently I know of a case where they immediately arranged; they acknowledged the corn, so to speak, but on general principles they do not, nor do we assume responsibility for someone that takes ill a month after they get here.

Q. That was not my point at all. This man who was such a charge upon a particular village, was brought there under the railway agreement and had no place to go. In fact he had no destination at all, and became a charge within a few weeks.—A. Our information is that he worked for some time. I have not all the facts but I would be glad to send them to you.

Q. You have the fact that the doctor of the village was in attendance upon him while he was working?—A. I cannot speak from memory. I just glanced over it.

Q. I think you will find that he was under the doctor's care a very short time after he arrived and he must have been in bad condition for many months previous to his arrival in order to be in the condition in which the doctor found him.—If we had had him early, we would have sent him home.

Q. Is the company responsible or can it be attached in any way for that? They have an inspection and are responsible in some degree.—A. They are not responsible except in this way: they pay all the charges of taking him back and landing him in his own country. If we bring him to them the cost is on them for taking him back.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. What organizations, Mr. Egan, are being given the use of land at a nominal rental to carry on their work? I mentioned one, the Scottish Immigration Aid, I think is the name of it?—A. Yes.

Q. They established a colony and have been granted a leasehold of land, some 1,116 acres, I think it is, at one dollar a year, for five years in the first place; and a couple of years before the term expired it was extended for a further period of five years, which if I remember correctly would terminate about 1933. Are there any other organizations that have been granted similar privileges?—A. No, sir, not that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

The WITNESS: May I be discharged, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: I think so.

Witness discharged.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Committee wish to call anyone else?

Mr. GLEN: That is all the evidence, Mr. Chairman, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN: If no one else is being called.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, may I ask if it would not be possible to expedite the printed report. I suggest that those in charge of the printing put forth a little extra effort to have it in our hands. What Mr. Egan gave us to-day, we should have at the earliest possible moment, as our time is very limited.

Mr. GLEN: If there are no further witnesses, I move that the Committee now close so far as evidence is concerned, to meet again on the call of the chair for consideration of the report of the sub-committee.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be of assistance in preparing the report, if we had expressions of opinion from some members of the Committee and I would suggest that another meeting of the Committee be called for that purpose. It can be without the presence of the reporters, if need be, so that everyone will be at perfect liberty to express his opinion, and then we can get the opinion of the various members of the Committee as to what improvements are desired or changes suggested in the report. I, therefore, suggest now that we meet for that purpose.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I would support that. I presume you do not intend to have a shorthand report of the meeting?

Hon. Mr. STEWART: No, it is for general discussion in camera. To discuss the report or anything that anyone wants to bring up. I think it would be of great help to the sub-committee who are responsible for drafting a report if they can get any ideas upon which they can act. I think it will facilitate the work very much. I can quite well understand that when the report is drafted there will likely be considerable difference of opinion about it and if we can compose as much of that as possible, it will be very helpful to the sub-committee.

Mr. GLEN: Then I move that the Committee close its deliberations now as far as evidence is concerned and meet again to-morrow for discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt Mr. Glen's motion?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee is now adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock, to sit in camera.

The Committee adjourned until Thursday, May 31, at 11 o'clock.

[Mr. W. J. Egan.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, March 13, 1928

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The committee proceeded with the consideration of the Immigration Act and Regulations, and the general subject of immigration.

Dr. J. A. AMYOT, deputy minister of the Department of Health, called and sworn.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I presume the doctor will follow the procedure followed by Mr. Egan, and give us a short résumé of the work of the medical health officers in connection with the admission of immigrants to Canada.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): If I may, I would suggest that he start as Mr. Egan did, with a general outline, beginning at the head office here.

The WITNESS: The function of the Department of Health, so far as immigration is concerned, is that of an advisor to the Department of Immigration as to the physical and mental condition of candidates who present themselves for emigration to this country; to classify those found to be certifiable according to the classes of the prohibited classes of immigrants coming to the country. Advice only is the service of the Department of Health; we have no executive power whatever. It is not the Department of Health which rejects the immigrants; the only thing we say is "This immigrant is insane" or that he is classed under "A" in the third clause, and that by the Act he is in the prohibited class. If he has tuberculosis he comes under another clause or subsection of clause 3, and as such is a prohibited immigrant, when he is classified as such within the Immigration Department's meaning of the Act. Then the Immigration Department, under the Act, have the executive power to deal with that individual. That is the first relationship.

As to the organization of the medical service in this Department of Health: it is part of what we call the division of foreign quarantine; immigration, medical examination, and the care of the lepers in Canada. This division is the one under which they fall, and it has at its head Dr. Paget, an old officer of the previous Department of Immigration and of the Department of Agriculture dealing with this particular question. One of his functions is that of choosing medical officers, training them so that they will be qualified to make a medical examination of an immigrant coming into the country, because up to this time the final examination was held on this side where we are on our own grounds and where we have the legal right. Previous to 1903 there was no medical examination; everybody was allowed to come in as they wished, except when the quarantine stopped them for quarantinable diseases.

The United States instituted medical examinations of immigrants coming into their country, and Canada followed suit. Our first medical officers were part-time medical officers at the ports of entry in Canada, Halifax, Quebec, St. John, Vancouver, and Victoria. Later on about 1919 or 1920 the officers were made permanent because of the difficulty of getting regularly qualified

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

men, and the difficulty of having them there at all times—permanent officers were appointed, who could be trained. At that time directions and instructions to medical officers were prepared as to what they should look for, the significance of symptoms, what these symptoms indicated, and why these medical examinations were to be carried out. Canada asked from her former experience, that certain people should be kept out of this country—people who were medically unfit to come into the country, because later on these people might become public charges, and if they bred true might give us calycax. That is the general demand of the country for that sort of thing. The demand has come from all the provinces and all of the people dealing with those who had to go to hospitals and sanitarium and places of detention and to the police force who wanted to keep out those who were not considered fit to come into the country, and this little book of instructions (indicating) is to indicate to the medical officers, so far as the medical side was concerned, what they should look for, what the intentions were, the significance of them, and as to enable them to come to a judgment of whether they fell under the prohibited classes or not.

If I may presume to give them to you, the prohibited classes include the following:—

No immigrant, passenger or other person unless he is Canadian citizen, or has Canadian domicile, shall be permitted to enter or land in Canada, or in case of having landed in or entered Canada shall be permitted to remain therein, who belongs to any of the following classes, hereinafter called "prohibited classes":—

(a) Idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons and persons who have been insane at any time previously;

(b) Persons afflicted with tuberculosis in any form or with any loathsome disease, or with a disease which is contagious or infectious or which may become dangerous to the public health, whether such persons intend to settle in Canada or only to pass through Canada in transit to some other country.

Those are the two medical ones; those are the prohibited classes who, under no consideration, should be allowed into Canada.

Now, there is a third class which, in their judgment, might be held out. They are:—

Immigrants who are dumb, blind, or otherwise physically defective, unless in the opinion of a Board of Inquiry or officer acting as such they have sufficient money, or have such profession, occupation, trade, employment, or other legitimate mode of earning a living that they are not liable to become a public charge, or unless they belong to a family accompanying them or already in Canada, and which gives security satisfactory to the Minister against such immigrants becoming a public charge.

Those are the prohibited classes—under our own Act of Parliament.

Now, these medical officers, under the older system, examined the immigrant as he came off the boat. In Quebec sometimes two or three boats are there with 1,500 to 2,000 passengers on board—we have had as many as three or four boats at a time, with passengers waiting to depart. We arranged so that three or four medical officers would stand in a row, as the individuals came up the ramp, and the medical officers would do the best they could to catch those who were idiots, imbeciles, insane, epileptics, tubercular, or suffering from loathsome diseases, and so on. That was his chance, and the only one he had. They become more or less accustomed to looking for certain things, and if he saw certain indications, he would pick them out and examine them afterwards. That is what we call "catching them on the ramp", and in many

cases they had to pass about 300 an hour to get them off the ship. They picked as many as they could; we trained them as well as we could; we got as good men as we could. We always had back in our minds that if we missed them, and they got out and got back in the country, it would be possible, when the local authorities objected to them, to find them, and if we found they were suffering from a certain disease at the time they landed, they could then be deported. In order to strengthen and help out the service, the steamship companies were held responsible for a medical examination of their own. We had no legal position at all. It was stated that if a steamship company brought to this country individuals who could, by a competent medical examination, have been found to come under one of these prohibited classes, the steamship company had to take them back, refund their fare, and pay a fine of \$200; so that we had that check behind us for holding them back.

Then there were certain immigrants, who came over on assisted passage, assisted by either the British Government or certain societies aided by the British Government, or certain societies in our own country who went and picked out the immigrants and brought them to this country, and in both Canada and Great Britain assisted them in contributing towards the cost of their transportation to Canada and their settlement here. Those were assisted passage cases. It was insisted upon that all of these should be medically examined on the other side before they started, but no regular organization was established for it, and they went to this doctor and that doctor, and the other doctor, to have that examination; oftentimes it was the doctor of some society. They picked out a lot. That method picked out a number whom, otherwise, we would have had to deport from Canada, but it was unsatisfactory because their point of view was not ours.

May I be permitted to explain that a little? A doctor looking at a patient may look at him from two different standpoints; one of these is, as a practitioner does, "What is wrong with you?" "Well, a little temperature up; a little restless; coughing a little; I do not think there is much wrong with you, but a trip to Canada will do you good; get away from here; perhaps a little irritable; does not place himself well", and so on. Well, get him out of these surroundings and send him to Canada. That is the medical standpoint. But that is not what we want. When an insurance company sends an individual to a doctor, they say to the doctor, "Is that man a good risk for our Insurance Company; we are going to put money up on him; how long is he likely to live; has he anything wrong with him which will make him a bad risk?" We are in the same position, and we want the medical examination made from that standpoint. It is the same thing in the army; is a man fit to stand the gruelling military life; is he fit to stand the heavy-service of civilian life, such as the Postal Service and so on? There are two standpoints and two points of view in examining a patient.

Now, many of the examinations which were made over there by the medical officers were made by the first class of doctors who were looking on the immigrants as patients, not as risks for Canada. What we are after is the viewpoint of the risks for Canada, so that the medical examination for those assisted passages was not as thorough as it should be, principally because of that idea. There were others in the backs of their minds, but we need not discuss them.

Now, some five or six years ago—I cannot give the exact date—the medical service, acting for the immigration services of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Canada in Great Britain, came together and said, "Could we not devise some agreement whereby we could get these medical examinations by men who had been instructed as to how to examine the individual, when they are coming to the various countries?" So the four countries got together,

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

and they picked out what we call the "Roster" which is simply a list of doctors. These doctors which they picked were doctors who were accustomed to examine for insurance, who were examining for the Civil Service and for the army service. That was the object they had in view, and that was agreed to by these four countries, to make their examinations in the various parts of Great Britain, and 1,750 doctors were chosen, and placed on this Roster.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. When was this, please?—A. About four or five years ago. Everyone of them were furnished with a book of instructions which is uniform for the four countries.

Q. May I ask sir, if the instructions issued to the doctors overseas are now the same as they were then?—A. Yes, the same ones; it is all in the same form. This form is a compilation of instructions given by the various governments I have mentioned, and also by the United States, and a compilation to suit our own situation in Canada. They were furnished with those instructions; every one of these doctors were circularized, and then we said that the assisted passages should have these particular doctors to make these examinations so as to get over the difficulty of the doctor's attitude concerning the patients. The assisted passages amounted to approximately one-sixth of the immigrants who were coming to Canada. These had to be medically examined and the other five-sixths were optional; they were going to be examined on this side, but over in the old country they did not necessarily have to be examined. The Immigration Department said if any of these immigrants or prospective immigrants came within the prohibited clauses, they could not enter Canada; the Department said to them, "If any of you have any doubt as to your condition, go to the medical man and get his advice." The Immigration Department said, "The medical service is picked out, and we have this Roster of doctors; go to one of them; he is one who knows, and he will go over you, and if he finds that you were in any of these prohibited classes he will tell you not to go to Canada, or not to go to South Africa, or any of these four countries, because if you do when the medical examination is made finally, you may be rejected, and will be sent back, and you may have sold all of your belongings, and you will have this stigma of having been deported, upon you. So go to these officers and find out first of all if you come under any of these prohibited classes. You can do it cheaply; it will only cost you 10/6 for each adult to have this examination made; mind you, it is voluntary. It will only cost you 10/6, if you are an adult; and 2/6 for each child." This amount is very small, but it was regularized. Many physicians who went on this Roster charged much more for their examinations and we had some difficulty in getting them to accept that situation, but they finally accepted it, a fee of 10/6 for adults, and 2/6 for each child, and the prospective immigrant paid the fee.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

Q. To whom was that paid?—A. To the Roster doctor. He was a private practitioner and nothing more; he had no official capacity. He was engaged to make the examination and advise with the individual who might go to him for an examination.

Now, not all of the immigrants went to these Roster doctors, and we had to examine those on this side. When they went to the Roster doctors, it made no difference, as we had to examine them anyway, and we examined them on this side, but were never able to hold up those we felt ought to be held up. In consequence of that, last year, I believe something like 500 had to be deported from Canada, out of the hundreds of thousands of immigrants who got through into this country. We looked upon that as a failure of our system which we had developed as well as we could, and we could not get it any better. We could

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

not develop it any more; we had done the best we could; we had worried day and night to get the right kind of men to examine these immigrants, and we could not do any differently. Many of them had to be deported, and go back and pick up what was left, if it was to be picked up, and I can assure you gentlemen there were hardships. If any of you have experience with the municipalities which have to look after these people, and have noticed how kindly they are treated, you will not have much sympathy with them. But, in the long run, the patients had to go back to the Old Country.

The Medical Service of the Department of Health was then faced with one of two alternatives. One of these was that we should improve the service on this side to make the examination more perfect—better. We could not do that with what we had. We might have established an Ellis Island. Now, the principle of the Ellis Island system is this: Immigrants coming to the United States with no examination at all are taken off the ship in lighters and brought to Ellis Island, sometimes at the rate of 3,000 or 4,000 or 5,000 or 10,000 a day. You can imagine that in making examinations of that number, they may not be handled any too gently; they are hustled around, and may be held there three or four or five days. Of course, they are fed there. When they have finished the examinations, if the immigrants are allowed to come in, they are again loaded on to lighters and sent to the wharves in New York City and sent off to the trains.

We were faced with that condition as a possibility in Canada. That system has received a great deal of criticism on the other side. Great Britain has sent deputations and parliamentary committees out to see what the situation was, and they did not like it. The United States said to them, "If you want to avoid that, if you want to avoid the milling your people get at Ellis Island we have a proposition to make to you; we will establish in England at strategic points, where there are United States Consuls, United States Medical officers, who will examine every individual who comes up for a passport previous to entry into the United States, and the examinations shall be made there. If they are passed, the signature of the officer shall be put upon the pass-port, and the photograph of the individual shall be punched by this officer with his personal punch, which means that the individual has passed. Those who shall be rejected will be set back for further examination, and if, later on, they are found to be passable they will be reconsidered. But if they are within some prohibited class"—"and they have the same prohibited clauses that we have,"—"they will not be allowed to go forward." Great Britain said, "Yes, we will do that", and to-day, starting with a few officers, the United States has some thirteen officers in Great Britain doing this work in certain centres like London, Birmingham, Liverpool, Glasgow, and so on. In many of these offices they have two or three, and sometimes four officers. They have, altogether thirteen in Great Britain.

Now, everybody has to go to these officers. There is the quota law in the United States, and there are only a fixed number permitted to leave each month. These have to appear at these consular offices. If they are passed there, the doctor puts his signature on the pass-port and punches the photograph. They are all examined there, and they have a regular flow. Each medical officer has been handling on an average of between 6,000 and 8,000 individuals a year. When you have a man sitting in front of you, you can tell much better what his condition is, but even then you cannot always do it. The best experts in the world cannot tell some of the intermediate stages of paranoia, or dementia precox, or some forms of insanity, but he can catch a lot of them, and get their trend of thought and so on from a general conversation with them, and perhaps a physical examination, although not an extensive one. Of course, where he is in doubt, he puts them in a separate room, and makes a thorough examination, for the good of the individual himself.

Then the United States said to Great Britain, "If we do that, these individuals who come over on the boats, and this medical examination having been previously made, and with the signature of the officer on the pass-port, and the photograph properly punched, when they land at the wharves in the United States, the medical officer"—in the same relationship to Immigration as our medical officers are to our Department of Immigration—"will look at a man as he comes off the boat; he will say, 'yes, that is the man's photograph; it looks like the individual; his pass-port is in order; we will pass him on.'" That is all the medical examination that is made, unless the officer on this side sees that something has happened in the meantime. An immigrant may by this time have developed a further stage of his mental condition, kicking everybody around, "flying his kite," all through the place, as some crazy men do, and they of course, will be held for a further examination, but ordinarily the immigrants are passed right through, and no further examination is made.

As I said, we were faced with two alternatives, either the establishment of an Ellis Island or a system of medical examinations more perfect than we had. We are in a different position from the United States, inasmuch as we are looking for immigrants; we are dealing with our own people in Great Britain. We have to go to them, and our service is a little more complicated than the service of the United States, where everybody has to come to the consular office.

The advice was given to the Immigration Department and to the Government, and the Privy Council decided that the principle to be adopted was that instead of the establishment of an Ellis Island, a medical examination on the other side would be made to avoid people leaving their country without an examination, to make that examination as thorough as possible to protect our country against the entrance of those people who were undesirable, and to admit only those whom we really desired. That was accepted by Council. An Order was made instituting the medical service overseas. At first, we thought we could do with twenty officers. We had two officers in Great Britain, Doctor Jeffs, our medical officer, and his assistant, Dr. Parney, who had been there for three or four years.

The Civil Service Commission advertised for medical officers. The salaries to be paid to these medical officers was, for Grade 1, \$3,000 a year,—which is not a magnificent salary—and because they would be jumping around from one place to another, \$660 was added for expenses, so that the salary really was \$3,660 for each man. That is Grade 1. They were raised \$120 each year, with the expense allowance remaining the same. This was raised four times, and then they started on the second grade, with an allowance of \$700, with the third grade starting at \$4,000, raised \$120 each year, with an expense allowance of \$900 a year.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Do you mean that the Canadian doctors all started in Grade 1 and then were raised to grades 2 and 3?—A. We had some over there who were familiar with the situation, and we put them on in Grade 3, and one in Grade 2. The new ones all started in Grade 1.

Q. The inspections there are all done by Canadian doctors?—A. Yes, since the 14th of February; and, as a preliminary canter, before the 14th of February.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Were these doctors permitted to engage in private practice?—A. No, they were full-time doctors.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. Was that examination precautionary or final?—A. By the medical officer?

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

Q. The one to whom you are referring?—is that precautionary or final?

A. No; the final examination is made here, the same as it would be in the United States. We are following their method of doing it, but the immigrants will not be held for examination here when the doctor's name is on the identification card. As we have no passports from Great Britain, we have an identification card with a photograph of the individual. These doctors will punch the cards, and our doctors here will recognize the punch marks. They can identify the photograph as being that of the same individual, and will pass him right along.

Q. Supposing, as a matter of fact, there is a rejection on the final examination in Canada; who pays the transportation back?—A. If he is a prohibited immigrant, the steamship company would be held responsible for taking him back; if there is any doubt, this country pays it.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. Even if he has passed in the Old Country?—A. The doctors in the Old Country have no legal status; I am not speaking of the doctors we have now.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. Even if he has passed one of them in the Old Country?—A. We are hoping that will not occur too often. We are probably not perfect and may not catch them all, but we think we will be in a position to catch them much better than we have been.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Does that examination by our doctors in England apply to all immigrants or only those of assisted passage?—A. All immigrants coming to this country will have to be medically examined since the 14th of February, 1928.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You said that all of these examinations were conducted by these doctors whom you have described. We had the impression the other day that there were some prospective immigrants in outlying districts who would still be examined by these Roster doctors?—A. I will come to that.

We had 68 applications for the first 19 doctors selected. We sent over Dr. Margaret Parkes, a female doctor who was in our service, so we would have the female doctors represented. Nineteen others were to be appointed, because the Order in Council called for twenty. There were sixty-eight applications for these positions.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Dr. Amyot, I can understand that you may not have the information now, but it just occurs to me to ask you if you know whether any rejections have taken place on this side in the case of immigrants from the United Kingdom who have been examined since our Canadian doctors were appointed?—A. No, I do not know that yet. Our arrangement is to get these men over, and we commenced sending them over shortly after Christmas. The ground has been gone over in England, and we have a certain number of picked situations. These big centres are the following: The London area, Birmingham, Bristol, York, Londonderry, Liverpool, Glasgow, Inverness, Belfast, Paris (on the Continent) Hamburg, Antwerp, Rotterdam, Riga, and Danzig. Those are the centres upon which these medical officers will be centred. On the Continent these medical officers will be in the same position as the medical officers in Great Britain; people will have to come to them except in very exceptional instances. There will be central offices, very carefully picked, and the outlying places will be visited sometimes twice a week, sometimes once a week, some-

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

times once a month, depending on the number of prospective immigrants. These places have been chosen upon the advice of the local people, the departments of labour, the departments of health, and the labour organizations. We have chosen 334 situations outside of our central station in Great Britain. We have provided them with cars to enable them to go to these outlying places. We have found places for them to have their offices. We have the offices in the immigration building when we can; we have them in the town halls when we can; we have them in the hospitals and clinics when we can; and we have them in special buildings when we can, and in some cases we have had to go to the hotels—

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Those are what they call the public houses?

The WITNESS: Yes, those are the public houses, which, in Great Britain, are totally different from the public houses here. They are homes or clubs in Great Britain and people have not the horror of them that they have here.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I interjected that remark, because we are experiencing considerable criticism in regard to public houses.

The WITNESS: We found there was some objection and at the present time—or on the 1st of April—there will only be six out of the 334—and perhaps only four—in these public houses which have been recommended to us by the automobile clubs, by the town councils, and by authorities who know the local conditions. We have picked the best of them for the purpose of these examinations. If I may be permitted to read a letter, I would like to put it on the record. This is a letter from the Ministry of Health in Great Britain in support of this very thing, and after I read it, you will be enabled to see the support they are giving us. This letter is dated the 31st of August, 1927, and is signed by H. W. S. Ferris, the assistant secretary of the Ministry of Health. It is addressed to the clerk of the Council and reads as follows:—

I am directed by the Minister of Health to acquaint you that it has been decided by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, in conjunction with His Majesty's Government, to establish in Great Britain a Canadian Medical Service, under which the medical examination of prospective settlers in that Dominion will be carefully systematized and conducted free of charge. The present practice, under which the medical examination is conducted by private medical practitioners, who are not always familiar with the requirements of the Dominion authorities, has in some cases proved inconvenient. Moreover, the fact that the intending settler has at present to pay a fee for the examination has been found to act as a deterrent on migration, as many otherwise desirable settlers are unable to provide the fee or are unwilling to spend money which will be wasted in the event of the medical examination being unfavourable. For these reasons, the Canadian Immigration authorities have decided to arrange for the medical examination in this country, by officers responsible to the Canadian Government, of intending migrants to the Dominion.

With a view to diminishing as far as possible the inconvenience and cost to the intending migrants of attending for medical examination, it is proposed to hold the examinations in a number of different centres, and it has been suggested to the Minister that the county and county Borough Councils would in many cases be able to afford facilities for this purpose in premises belonging to them, and would, also, where this is not possible, be able to assist the Canadian Government by referring their Medical Officers to sanitary authorities and others who would be able to provide the required assistance. The examinations would be held at fixed intervals and at pre-arranged times and the persons to be examined

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

would be notified by the Canadian Immigration Authorities of the time and place at which to attend.

His Majesty's Government attach great importance to any arrangement which will have the effect of removing obstacles in the way of the settlement in the overseas Dominions of suitable persons from this country, and it has long been their desire to relieve the intending settler of the expense of the medical examination required by the Dominion authorities.

In these circumstances, the Minister is sure that he can rely upon the co-operation of the "Councils and their staffs in this matter, and has requested the Canadian representative in this country, Dr. H. B. Jeffs, Chief Medical Adviser, the Canadian Building, Trafalgar Square, London, S.W. 1, to communicate directly with the Clerks to the Councils in cases in which their assistance is sought."

I might say that in Northern Ireland the same thing, in practically the same words, has been passed in regard to their various people.

Now, the Department of Health in Great Britain had to deal with sending immigrants,—migrants—to Canada and they had a lot of trouble with them, and, to use an ordinary street term, they are "tickled to death" over this arrangement. This will relieve them of a great deal of difficulty. It was said that the medical men of Great Britain would object to this. There were some objectors to it, but the General Council said, "Canada has the right to make these examinations, and has a right to make them by their own people", and there has been no objection from the General Council, so that with their approval the number of examinations which have been made amount to something over—12,000—.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Dr. Amyot, will you tell the committee what the General Council is, although some of us happen to know?—A. In Great Britain there is a licensing body, as there is in Canada. In Canada, we have the Dominion Council, which is the licensing body for medical men having certain examinations for the various provinces of Canada. Each province has its own medical body known as the College of Physicians and Surgeons in each province, and they examine the medical men to see if they are fit to go into practice. It is the same thing in Great Britain. Over there it is one of the oldest and best organized bodies imaginable, and takes up a lot of questions relating to medical men and their complaints, acting on them and endeavouring to regulate them. The British Medical Journal is their publication. It is the most representative body of medical men in Great Britain. We have their approval in regard to our work.

Now, up to the 5th of February of this year, 12,000 have been examined. On the 14th of February it became obligatory, so that any who left Great Britain on or after the 14th of last month, or landed in this country on or after the 14th of February, have been examined. That is the service we have in the Old Country and we are hoping it will reduce a lot of the ills we are heir to. Canada has every justification for keeping out these prohibited classes, and parliament has passed the Act to insure that they will be prohibited. They have designated certain prohibited classes, and we are here to help the Immigration service in that particular respect.

That is an outline of our work. I hope you will pardon me for my long dissertation, but that is an outline of the relationship of the medical service to the Department of Immigration.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Now, what about the Continent.

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. Before you leave that angle, doctor, may I ask how many rejections there were out of the 12,000 examinations?—A. There were over 500 rejections. The largest number of them were for physical defects, such as blindness, deafness, heart disease, or something which would prevent an immigrant from being able to earn a living; diabetes, Brights disease, or some physical defect of that kind. If a man has an arm or a leg off, the Minister has the power to judge whether or not he is able to do certain work. For the other defects, such as tuberculosis, insanity, epilepsy and so forth, there is no choice; they are absolutely prohibited.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. I think you said you were going to take up another point; that is, the possibility of being examined by other than Canadian doctors?—A. Although we have 334 stations where the medical officers can go, there are other places which it is difficult to reach. For instance, down in Cornwall; our experience has shown us that six, or eight or ten immigrants come from that section in a year, and arrangements have been made there with certain Roster doctors whom our officers know are reliable and who know what the Act calls for, and they will be able to make the examinations there, and we will pay them rather than have the patient pay them. Then, another thing: there will necessarily be times when one or two officers in a station cannot examine all of the individuals who present themselves, and we propose to take temporarily, on part-time, with a set schedule of fees, certain medical officers of Great Britain probably off that old Roster, and we will have them come in and make examinations. But even then their examinations will be checked over by our own men.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Do I understand that previous to the appointment of these Canadian doctors overseas, the Minister had a latitude which he does not now possess in the way of admitting people?—A. No, it is the same thing; the law has not been changed.

Q. If an intending immigrant was rejected after a medical examination as being insane or feeble-minded or any of those other things mentioned in section 3, the Minister had no authority to over-ride that medical decision?—A. No; he has no authority to over-ride it.

Q. Just one other question; do I understand that the medical doctors confine themselves entirely to the physical and mental condition of the intending immigrants; that somebody else inquires into their previous history? For instance, a man might be physically and mentally all right, and yet have criminal tendencies; does the doctor inquire into that?—A. No, except in so far as it might appear in his mental attitude.

Q. It is not up to the doctor to look for that?—A. No, although that is often supplied to him by inquiry from other people around about. It might appear in a medical examination, and what they find out would then make it a subject for determination by the Immigration Department.

Q. Is there a list of questions put to an intending immigrant?—A. Medically, no.

Q. Apart from that, can you say whether there is a regular list of questions submitted to intending immigrants which they have to answer?—A. Medically, no. I do not know anything about the others, but medically there is nothing. A patient comes before a doctor and the doctor makes his examination. It has been said somewhere that there were 94 questions asked of prospective immigrants, but there are none medically.

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. A few moments ago you said that of the 500 rejections, the Minister had a certain discretion following those rejections. Will you explain to the Committee what discretion he has and where it can be exercised?—A. I would have to go back to the prohibited classes. We will call them "A" and "B", idiots, embiles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, persons insane, or persons who have been insane at any time previously. Then the next, Class B, the tubercular in any form and loathsome diseases. Those are prohibited. Now, the prohibited immigrant comes to the Minister—

Q. We understand the Act perfectly, but you must have had something in your mind when you said there were 500 rejections by your doctors but that the Minister still had power to let some of them in?—A. The Minister has power, through his officers, to deal with physical defectives. If they find, for instance, that a man has both of his legs off and is a good watchmaker, the Minister could say there was a man physically defective, but is able to earn his living. If he were thrown on the general labour market, he would be of no value, and might become a public charge, but as he is a good watchmaker, he would, perhaps, admit him.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. Under what section do you find that?—A. I cannot give you the number of the section.

Q. Is it in section 4?—A. I think it is.

"(1) The Minister may issue a written permit authorizing any person to enter Canada, or having entered or landed in Canada to remain therein without being subject to the provisions of this Act. Such permit shall be in the form A of the schedule to this Act, and shall be expressed to be in force for a specified period only, but it may at any time be extended or cancelled by the Minister in writing. Such extension or cancellation shall be in the form AA of the schedule to this Act."

Q. I merely wanted to know if that was the section you had in mind?—A. Yes.

Q. Is there any other section which gives the Minister the authority to issue permits, with which you are familiar?—A. No.

Q. Then where, in that section, does it say that he can deal with a man with one or two legs off, or with any person he chooses?—A. You are asking me a question which deals with the immigration side. As a medical man, I prefer not to answer that question.

Q. I want to make it plain so that the Committee will understand my attitude. If I am in any way breaking into your statement at this stage, in a way you do not want, I will not press it for the moment, but if you are through, I would like to ask a question or two as to the authority of the Minister under section 4.—A. I will have to leave that to the Immigration Department.

Mr. COOTE: Before you leave that, doctor, are you not perhaps referring to subsection 3 of section 3 of the Act, which reads:—

Immigrants who are dumb, blind, or otherwise physically defective, unless in the opinion of a Board of Inquiry or officer acting as such they have sufficient money, or have such profession, occupation, trade, employment or other legitimate mode of earning a living that they are not liable to become a public charge or unless they belong to a family accompanying them or already in Canada and which gives security satisfactory to the minister against such immigrants becoming a public charge.

A.—Yes, that is the one in which he has discretion.

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

Mr. Ross (Moose Jaw): I submit that these questions are not proper ones to be put to the medical authorities at all.

The WITNESS: All the medical officers can say to the Immigration Department is that there are certain conditions present in the individual, and then it is up to the Immigration Department as to whether the man may be admitted or not. The medical service does not exclude him at all.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the members of the Committee should confine their questions to Dr. Amyot to the medical end of the immigration question.

Mr. Boys: I think that is correct. The only reason I asked the questions was because Dr. Amyot himself made the statement concerning the authority of the Minister.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. I understood you to say that if anyone were rejected under sections A or B and prohibited by the medical men, the Minister has no power whatever to override the decision?—A. The medical man does not prohibit it. He simply says he is suffering from a certain condition.

Q. And the Minister would have no right?—A. The Immigration Department deals with that, but in certain cases the Minister has no right to admit that immigrant.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. Are you not venturing a legal opinion there?—A. Every day we have that in our mind.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: I think we should get on with the evidence.

Mr. COOTE: Yes, then we will hear about the Continent.

The WITNESS: On the Continent the arrangement is that the prospective immigrants come through certain ports; for instance, Riga, where they come in from Latvia, and where such Russians who can escape through there appear. Danzig handles chiefly the Polish and the Central Europeans, with some Germans; the free port of Hamburg and Bremen, and then Antwerp and Paris. They come from the southern countries usually through Paris; that is our strategic point. Examinations are made there, and they get their passports there because they must have passports to come from the Continent, and a medical officer's signature is put on the passports there.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. You say usually?—A. They nearly all come through that way. None of them can come without medical examination. I suppose there are some cases where they escape, but if they have not their card or their passport when they land here, they will be medically examined here.

Q. Would you go into more detail on that, in regard to the immigrants who come to this country from south of that line referred to by the Minister—

Hon. Mr. STEWART: You mean the Deputy Minister?

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): No, I mean the Minister, in his speech in the House.

The WITNESS: I know nothing about that at all. I heard the evidence given the other day, and they asked about that line. All we do is to examine what is handed to us and the examination is made in Paris of those coming from the south, usually from Italy; or if not, it is made at the port of debarkation in Canada.

Q. I had Italy or Greece in mind. Do they have to come to the Paris office?—A. Not all of them.

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

Q. What is the system? What about the examination of those from southern and southeastern Europe?—A. They would have to pass through there, and would have to be examined by our own officers. So far, that has not been provided for. There are certain difficulties in the way. For instance, Italy did not want her people to go out, and when they were deported from another country they would not take them back. But they have receded from that position recently, and have asked that a medical examination be made. They have heretofore refused to have any examination made by any foreigners in their country, claiming it was an insult to their flag, but the probabilities are that within a very short time such examinations will be held in Italy, the same as in Paris, at some strategic point.

Q. At the present time those from Austria-Hungary, Greece, and Italy, except those who go through Paris, take their chances on this side?—A. Yes. Norway and Denmark have asked that medical officers be established in their countries, but that is for the Department of Immigration. When the offices are established we will send officers there.

Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Have you finished now with the continent?—A. Yes, that is about all I can say about that.

Q. Getting back to Great Britain again, and the 500 rejections; what were they for?—A. Up to Saturday, February 18, the number of examinations conducted by Medical Officers overseas was 13,700; that was up to February 18. I was speaking previously of February 5, when I said, 12,000. Of these 13,700, 4,700 were from the Continent and 9,000 from the British Isles. I am afraid I have not the exact figures with me.

Q. I wonder if you have a classification of the physical defects.—A. I thought I had it, but I am afraid I have mislaid it somewhere.

Q. Can you give it to us approximately?—A. The physical defects run somewhere about 470; there were some 500 and some certified, but we will say 470.

Q. Can you state the classifications of those?—A. The rest were all the other classifications either under A. and B.

Q. Can you sub-classify the physical defects at all?—A. No; we have not subclassified them to that extent.

Q. Have you, in the department?—A. Oh, yes, I think we could.

Q. For instance, how many tuberculars?—A. Yes I would not like to venture the exact number however.

Q. Can you put that in later, doctor?—A. Yes, I will do that. (Statement requested follows):

Certifications out of 4,937 British and 2,852 Continental migrants examined by our Canadian doctors during November and December 1927 and January 1928, under the Prohibited Classes of Section 3, of the Immigration Act, are as follows under each subsection:

- (a) 59 mental and Nervous,
- (b) 31 Tuberculous and loathsome diseases,
- (c) 408 Physically defective interfering with their ability to earn a living,
- (k) 47 Constitutionally psychopathic inferiors,
- (m) 111 So mentally defective as to affect their ability to earn a living.

Total, 656.

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

By Mr. Millar:

For the benefit of those who might read this evidence out in the country, more than for the benefit of the Committee, I would like to ask a question. Out in the country where there are so many agitators at work, they have made some very silly charges, and one of them is that a Scotch girl was deported because she had bow-legs. That has been repeated on many platforms and amongst hundreds of people, and some of them have taken it quite seriously? You never heard of such a thing?—A. No, I never have.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: You would not have known that five years ago, until the styles changed.

The WITNESS: There are such extreme cases of bow legs where a girl might not be able to earn a living.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. I know you have described certain diseases and I also know that you cannot check everybody up, but I would like to ask you your opinion of what happened in a certain case. About 1923, a young man came to Western Canada suffering from tuberculosis affecting one lung. He was not in a very serious state then, but there was a distinct lesion. He stayed in Canada for about a year, and then went to South Africa. He finally returned to Ireland, and came back to Canada in 1926, very much worse. He went back to Ireland last year, and I understand he is dying. How was he able to get into Canada twice, suffering from tuberculosis?—A. Well, it is true that we must sometimes fail, and even tubercular people will come. The veterinary profession have the same experiences that we have. This disease cannot always be diagnosed except by making some very delicate tests, and it is difficult in many cases to find tuberculosis. Sometimes even extreme cases get through. We have had them get through and die of hemorrhage within four or five weeks after they came into Canada. It is a failure of diagnosis and even the most expert will miss that on occasion. Then, examining at the rate of 300 an hour, I suppose even some of our medical officers get tired and an immigrant might very easily escape through. Then, too, the patients themselves, sometimes become very expert in getting through, and they find ways of doing it. For instance, I have heard of men carrying their bags in such a way as to cover up their lameness.

Q. I could understand how that could be in 1923, but it seems to me that in 1926 the facial appearance of the man would indicate to a mere tyro in diagnosis that he was suffering from tuberculosis?—A. It must have escaped the medical officer in some way.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You said the 13,000 went up to February 18th? What is the commencement date for that number of examinations?—A. Since the beginning of the year.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Are you through with your survey?—A. Yes.

Q. I want to know more about this McConachie case. What is your information in the Department about that?—A. I cannot give you the dates. I believe in the McConachie case, it was in connection with the fifth child in the family. It was examined by a Roster doctor, and our latest information is that he examined this child in July when it was about eight months old.

Q. July, 1927?—A. It arrived in this country when it was fourteen months old. He saw it in July, and it has only arrived within the last six weeks, we will say, although I do not know the exact date. The report does not say more than that he examined it. That is the last word we have. They came across

on the ship. We have that blunder-bus over the medical officers of the ship that if they let anybody through that a competent medical examination could have discovered as coming within the prohibited classes, they will be fined, so their medical officers are wide-awake. In this case, the ship's medical officer, reported to our medical officer in Halifax that he did not like the looks of this child and asked our medical officer to examine it. Our medical officer at Halifax examined the child in the regular routine. He picked up this child fourteen months of age, and suffering from physical defects which drew his attention to it. It had a big heavy jowl; its eyes were slanting; its mouth was half open; its tongue lolling out, with saliva running all over its cheeks; distinctly what we would call an imbecile. Because its eyes were on a slant, and running up in a slanting direction or almond-eyed as we call it, we would say it is of the Mongolian type, because its eyes looked like the eyes of a Chinaman. The child had a pronounced receding forehead, what they sometimes call a sliced head, sometimes they are sliced on one side. This was sliced backwards. In every way, it was an imbecilic looking child.

Q. Who was the doctor?—A. Dr. Rutherford. The child was examined in the ordinary routine and the medical officer's report given to the Immigration Department. They immediately formed what they call their Board, to see what to do with it then. They determined that this child undoubtedly fell under Class A of Section 3 of the Act, as a prohibited individual.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. How many were on the Board?—A. I don't know. A board may be composed of two or three; it usually is three.

Q. Does not the Act say three?—A. That is an Immigration matter. Let me explain to you about the Board. The Board took the medical officer's report and deported this individual. Dr. Clarke, our Assistant Deputy Minister, was in England at the time this child arrived in the Old Country, and with Dr. Jeffs and Dr. Parney, he saw the child, and he confirms absolutely Dr. Rutherford's diagnosis.

He said, there was the child with its tongue hanging down the side of its face, undoubtedly imbecilic looking, clearly within the scope of the prohibited classes, and he said that Dr. Rutherford's diagnosis was correct. Since then, an examination of this individual has been made and we have a telegram this morning from Professor Kirkpatrick Anderson, of Glasgow, one of the best men they could get, and he went farther than we did and calls this child an imbecile with Mongolian features. That is his diagnosis. This is the type that the law was made to cover, to exclude them from this country. (*Telegram here read into the record*):

Telegram received from Dr. Jeffs, London, England, this a.m., March 13th, 1928.

Doctor Kirkpatrick Anderson Professor of Psychiatry Glasgow examined McConachie baby and diagnosed imbecility with features mongolian idiot.

By Mr. MILLAR: A moment ago you said, "They deported it." Who deported it?

The WITNESS: The Immigration Department. The law is there; they were justified. You made the law for them. The law is there, and in the execution of their duties they deported this individual.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Who are Dr. Jeffs and Dr. Parney?—A. Dr. Jeffs is our Chief Medical Officer in Great Britain. He has been there for five or six years. Dr. Parney

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

is his assistant in Great Britain. Both of them are as astute medical officers as we have in our services.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. I gather that the child is adjudged imbecilic?—A. Absolutely.

Q. Then how in the world could one of your Roster doctors, ever pass it?—A. When I said Dr. Rutherford examined this child, he said it was feeble-minded. In his report he said that the tongue of this individual was normal. By the time the child got over to the Old Country, he said, its abdomen—as often happens in these feeble-minded cases, (their bellies stick out like this (indicating)—by the time this child got back to the Old Country the protusion of the abdomen was extreme, the tongue was already fissured; and the pupilla was standing up prominently on the tongue; typical of that condition. Dr. Clarke said it had every appearance of imbecility, and apparently it was more pronounced than when Dr. Rutherford examined it and called it feeble-minded. Now Professor Anderson makes the report that the child is an imbecile. Cases of this kind progress, and progress very rapidly in the early years of a child's life.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. I think you failed to bring out the time between the examination by the Roster doctor and the examination by Dr. Rutherford?—A. In the case of Dr. Rutherford's examination it was made quite recently—within the last six weeks, I understand.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. One was at eight months and the other at fourteen months?—A. Exactly.

Q. You have not quite answered my question. It may be that the changed condition took place between the examination when the child was eight months old, and that at the age of fourteen months. If that is your opinion, that is what I want to find out?—A. Yes.

Q. The point I had in mind was this; would you mind giving me the best opinion you can in regard to such a palpable case as you depict? One would wonder how any Roster doctor could have passed this child at eight months of age?—A. I do not think he made a careful examination because, even if it did progress in a few weeks, we would have had to deal with it. Perhaps in July he was not as bad as he looks now, because when a child is that age, and is just sitting around, or being carried around, it is not noticed so much, and the doctor might very well have passed it over, and not thought very much about it.

Q. But if a child's tongue was hanging out and saliva was running down its cheeks, I do not see how even a layman, much less a doctor could have failed to notice it?—A. As it stands now, there is no doubt about the condition of the child.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. What the country is interested in is not the condition it was in at five months of age, but the condition it was in at the time it was excluded by the Department. That is the thing which has aroused the indignation of the country, which, it is true, may show the humane nature of the people here.

By Mr. Ross (Moose Jaw):

Q. Is it possible that this child, at eight months, might not show any very great signs of imbecility, but still show it at fourteen months?—A. It is very much worse.

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Am I correct in saying that there was a Board of Inquiry on this particular child?—A. I should call it rather, a "Board of Action." It belongs to the Immigration Department.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. Under that Act, Section 13, this so-called Board of Inquiry is to consist of any three officers?—A. Yes.

Q. Was there such a Board held?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you a report of that Board?—A. No.

Q. When the Roster doctor examined that child, were the parents of the child given any certificate or memorandum of any kind?—A. No, I don't think so. They were simply told it might go on.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. There was a Board of Inquiry held, and the report was made to your Department. Now has the Minister any authority, under the Act, to admit that child?

Mr. Boys: Mr. Chairman, if we are going into this matter, I most certainly want to go into it. I have purposely refrained to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: That seems to be a question dealing with immigration.

Mr. GLEN: No, that is dealing with the Board of Inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN: That is under the Immigration Department, not under the Medical Department.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. If I understand your evidence correctly, it was to this effect; that when you made any recommendation with regard to any person who was unfit, under Section 3, Subsections A. B. and C. there is no appeal?—A. Under A. and B.

Q. What I want to know is, has anyone any authority over the recommendations of the Board of Inquiry?—A. Not over the Board of Inquiry. At least that is our impression, knowing the Act, that when the Board sits and makes a decision the Minister has no discretion whatever.

The CHAIRMAN: That is an Immigration matter?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. You mean there is no appeal from the decision of the Board to the Minister?—A. It means you cannot go back of that.

Mr. Boys: I thought we were going to leave the legal end alone to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: I would be glad if you would leave it alone.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. I was told that several doctors in private practice in Nova Scotia saw this child and proclaimed it normal. How do you explain that?—A. I do not know anything about that at all.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. I do not know whether this is going into the Immigration part of it or not, and I do not want to do that, but since the matter has been brought up by my friend here, (Mr. Millar) I would refer you Dr. Amyot to page 39 of the Act, where it says:—

In all other cases you may appeal to the Minister of Immigration and Colonization against any decision of the Board of Inquiry or officer in charge whereby you are ordered to be deported, unless such decision

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

is based upon a certificate of the examining medical officer that you are affected with a loathsome disease, or a disease which may become dangerous to the public health.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is an Immigration matter. Are there any other questions to ask Dr. Amyot?

Mr. SPOTTON: I would like to ask the doctor a question in regard to immigrants going to Australia being medically examined. There is an organization there, which I understand has said, "We sent 200 to-day to Australia, but were held up in sending them to Canada, and we only sent 65."—I may not have the figures correct. I saw a newspaper despatch from London, England, which stated that the Salvation Army was sending a large number to Australia but were being held up in some manner in sending immigrants to Canada and we only got a limited number. Would that be because your departmental regulations are too rigid?—A. No; I think probably when they were going to migrate, they felt that Canada was closer.

Q. No, the statement was clear; they had an equal chance to go to Canada, and the article read as if they preferred to go to Canada, but found it was easier to get to Australia.—A. It is the general impression that Australia does not put as much restriction on their people coming in. New Zealand puts on very much more.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. There is an impression in some quarters that the medical inspection, which immigrants must pass, is not as close and exacting coming from the Continent as from Great Britain?—A. I do not think there is any difference between them. There is this factor, that they do not speak the language; and there is a certain difficulty about the language. For example Czecho-Slovakians; the medical officers cannot ask them all the questions they would like, and he has to judge somewhat by appearances, and from what he can see. As a matter of fact, there are not as many rejections coming from the continent. They are better physically developed individuals.

Q. But there were quite a few thousands of Czecho-Slovakians, or people from that neighbourhood coming in last year; would the bulk of those be examined in Europe?—A. No; last year they were all examined here.

Q. Would the doctors have to pass on them?—A. Just as thoroughly as on any others.

Q. At the rate of several hundred an hour?—A. Yes, and that would be one of the difficulties.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Are they not examined by the steamship doctors, before they leave their own country?—A. They were not obliged to be; now, they will have to be examined on the other side. But up to the 14th of February they were not obliged to be examined. We said to the steamship doctors, "If you let anybody in, where a competent medical examination would have stopped them, we will fine the steamship companies, because they are the ones interested in bringing them out; we will make them refund all that they have charged in the way of fares, and bring them back to their homes. "Originally the fine was \$200 on top of all that, so that the steamship company will make some kind of sorting of these people. They are especially careful in order to save themselves the possibility of a fine by bringing those people out here.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Have the steamship companies been fined very often?—A. More frequently than they would like to be. I cannot give you the exact number, but

[Dr. J. A. Amyot.]

they do not like it very well. The United States fines them \$1,000, we only fine them \$200.

Q. Do you know whether there was any examination made by a medical man on behalf of the steamship company in connection with the McConachie case?—A. I do not know, but we have the fact that the doctor of the ship drew the attention of our medical man to this child.

Q. You have made reference to the precautionary measures taken by the steamship companies to avoid paying fines. What companies are they?—A. I do not know that.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. What provision is made for the examination at Ellis Island of intending immigrants to Canada?—A. The United States medical officers do the examining, and they say to our Immigration Department that these people are fit, and the Immigration Department has been accepting their examination.

The Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until Wednesday, March 14, at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, March 21, 1928.

J. N. K. MACALISTER called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Macalister, what is your occupation and position with the C.P.R.?—A. My title is Assistant Commissioner, Department of Colonization and Development. I am assistant to Colonel Dennis, the head of the Department.

Mr. CAHAN: Shall we ask questions or will the witness make a statement?

Mr. McMILLAN: Let the witness make a statement.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I think it would be a good idea to follow the line followed with Mr. Egan, and let the witness give a general outline of the work, which will suggest questions we may ask later.

By the Chairman:

Q. Are you prepared to make a statement?—A. Do you want a statement of the organization of our Department, and the activities we are carrying on?

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. In connection with immigration?—A. That is what we are organized for. I am not thoroughly prepared to make a complete statement, but I will do the best I can to outline what we have, what we are, and what we are doing. I will start in with our organization at headquarters in Montreal Windsor Station. First of all, I would like to point out distinctly that the Department of Colonization and Development of the Canadian Pacific Railway is a distinct department organized by itself and apart entirely from any other department of the Company's service, under the administration of Colonel J. S. Dennis, who has spent some 55 years in colonization activities in the Dominion. He has complete jurisdiction of the Department, reporting to our Chairman and President. As I said, I have the privilege of assisting him, trying to make myself generally useful.

Mr. H. C. P. Cresswell, our superintendent at Montreal, is in charge of what might be called a clearing house for the obtaining of settlement opportunities, nominations of colonists, and applications for colonists, either approving or refusing these various applications, under regulations, of course, laid down by Colonel Dennis, and of our staff in receiving and distributing colonists as they come forward to fill the places obtained. These various openings for the reception of colonists are obtained by eight district offices maintained by our Department in various parts of the Dominion and which I will describe in some detail a little later. Our Mr. Cresswell also has charge of our port staff, meeting incoming ships, assisting colonists in the operation of landing, putting their baggage through the customs, boarding proper trains for the destinations from which they will be distributed. He also has jurisdiction over our Montreal and Toronto district offices.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

The Department maintains a publicity branch in charge of Captain Ashley Edwards—who was, for a number of years, private secretary to Colonel Dennis and consequently has a very wide knowledge of colonization affairs in Canada, the United States, the British Isles and on the continent—with an assistant at London, England. This Department has, of course, charge of the preparation and issuance of all booklets prepared by the Department, the placing of our newspaper advertising in Canada, the United States and Great Britain. There is some other technical information in connection with that department, and I have a very short statement here that I would like to read, if I may take the time.

The Branch also issues a publication called "Agricultural and Industrial Progress in Canada", going to forty-five countries of the world in monthly issues of 12,000. It consists of twenty pages and articles relating to agricultural and industrial progress in Canada—covering the latest reports of agricultural and industrial conditions, and trade outlook, dealing in a comprehensive way with individual industries. Articles are about seven hundred words in length and may be copied with or without credit by the press.

A weekly supplement to the Bulletin is issued—6,000 copies weekly, going to forty-three countries of the world. This consists of short paragraphs touching upon commercial, industrial, and agricultural conditions, and based upon news received from correspondents in all parts of the Dominion. It is printed on a strip of about 18 inches long and 6 inches wide—a handy form for use by newspapers. These items, while technically known as "fillers", are of such a nature that they play an interesting part in outlining the progress of Canadian agricultural and industrial progress in what might be termed "capsule" form.

A daily news sheet of ten items is compiled and sent each day to certain newspapers and periodicals and to press correspondents in Canada, London, England, New York, and Chicago. These items are of a similar nature to those mentioned in the supplement and are disseminated through publicity sources in the abovementioned places. These sheets are mimeographed, eighteen copies being issued daily. These also serve the same purpose as a Supplement and are compiled from reports received by telegraph and mail from correspondents all over Canada.

The Bulletin and Supplement were inaugurated in 1919, the original mailing list being one hundred. Shortly after its inception, it was decided not to distribute these publications promiscuously but to send them only to those who write requesting their names to be placed on the mailing list. Its object, of course, is to interest capital in Canadian affairs and to promote desirable immigration into Canada.

A large library of motion picture films illustrating agricultural, industrial, and colonization activities in Canada is maintained at Montreal, the headquarters of the European Organization at London, also at Winnipeg and in the United States. These cover thirty-five topics involving fifty-three original reels—and with copies distributed throughout of the offices of the Department approximate 250 reels. These are available upon application by schools, theatres, clubs, societies, boards of trade, and other organizations, and are, of course, used by our own staff in lecturing campaigns.

During the past few years the Department has maintained a Bureau of Information at Montreal with branch libraries at London, England, and Chicago, and has advertised its willingness to supply information on Canadian conditions. Its slogan is "Ask the Canadian Pacific about Canada" and, as a result, thousands of inquiries reach headquarters and

branches every year. The information asked for covers all phases of Canadian activities. The libraries endeavour to keep abreast of the times by keeping up-to-date data and statistics. The requests come from widely separated countries, commercial and industrial organizations of all kinds, from individual students, and from a variety of other sources.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Can you give approximately the number of your 20 page circular distributed last year, and is that circular revised and brought up to date year by year?—A. You mean the booklet to which I have just referred, "Agricultural and Industrial Progress"?

Q. Yes.—A. It has a circulation of 12,000 a month with a new issue each month.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Is it printed in more than one language?—A. Just in English, sir.

We also maintain in Montreal an Exhibits Branch in charge of Mr. E. T. Noltie as Acting Director. He has, for many years, acted as Assistant to the late E. R. Bruce. I have a very short statement of the activities of our Exhibits Branch.

The Branch is now maintaining and keeping in first class up-to-date shape seventeen permanent agricultural exhibits in Canada, 13 in the United States—in addition, maintaining 12 portable display cases used by our staff in the United States—six portable display cases used by our staff in the British Isles, and three permanent exhibits in Europe. In addition, it maintains window displays at London, Glasgow, and Paris.

At the present time, arrangements are being made for twenty-seven additional window displays in the British Isles, a permanent exhibit at the Imperial Institute, London, England, and a permanent exhibit at Stockholm, Sweden.

During the past few years this Branch has participated in various international exhibitions held in various parts of the world.

A Section of the Branch is maintained in the West, which is constantly busy in collecting and arranging agricultural products with which permanent exhibits mentioned may be kept renewed.

It also co-operates to a considerable extent with our Traffic Department in various hotel exhibits, and various exhibits at large and small fairs held within Canada, but in these you are, of course, not interested.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. At what places on the continent are your permanent exhibits maintained? I think you mentioned Stockholm as one.—A. Brussels, Rotterdam and Oslo are the permanent exhibits, with window displays in London, Glasgow and Paris.

We still further maintain a development branch in charge of Major Ommenney as Director of Development, with a branch office at Winnipeg and representatives in our London sub-headquarters. This branch is maintained to further the development of natural resources, industrial resources, raw materials and minerals along the Company's lines.

(Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.)

Mr. MACALISTER (Reads):

The staff of the Development Branch under the Director of Development includes a number of experts, geologists, and mining engineers, for special work in the field, examining the resources along the Company's lines and obtaining information and preparing reports on possibilities of development as preliminary information for those interested. This service is given free of charge under certain conditions such as the responsibility and genuine interest of the parties seeking it and their inability for one reason or another to secure other professional advice.

Through the wide-spread organization of our Department throughout Canada, the United States, and Europe, the Development Branch is in an excellent position to obtain and give out information and get in touch with individuals, organizations or firms interested in Canadian development.

During the year this Branch handles a very large number of development inquiries on widely diversified subjects. In addition, it is continually adding to the store of information on the resources along the Company's lines, the classifying and filing of which is an important feature of the work.

This information has been compiled in a set of brief synopses each dealing with some particular resource, which now cover 59 different subjects. These are compiled by special authors, edited and revised up-to-date each year, and issued by the Branch, and published and printed through the Department's Publicity Branch.

Started in 1923, the issue of these publications has to the end of February, 1928, reached a total of 197,300 copies all issued on request.

In all of its work the Development Branch receives the finest co-operation and assistance from the various Federal and Provincial Government Departments with whom its work brings it in contact, as well as from technical associations such as the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, The Engineering Institute of Canada, The Pulp and Paper Association, etc.

Now, the Department maintains sub-headquarters at Winnipeg and at London, England. Our district offices in Canada are located at Montreal, covering Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, at Toronto, covering Ontario, at Winnipeg, covering Manitoba, at Saskatoon with a sub-office at Moose Jaw covering Saskatchewan, at Edmonton, covering central and northern Alberta, at Calgary, covering southern Alberta and a portion of British Columbia, and at Vancouver, covering the balance of British Columbia. These offices are organized with Assistant Superintendents of Colonization in charge. These men have been in the service of the Company and of our Department for long terms of years, averaging from ten to twenty years each. Each office has, of course, the necessary office staff, and in addition, has attached to it a staff of travelling colonization agents. Their duties are through their own efforts, through the efforts of various affiliated organizations and through the efforts of our station agents, to seek out and develop settlement opportunities for agricultural colonists, opportunities through which they can be settled upon farms, nominations from farmers in Canada covering their friends or relatives on the other side, and applications from farmers in Canada for the agricultural help or agricultural domestics they wish to employ. This campaign starts in the early Fall. The country is thoroughly combed by the various officers in their respective districts. It continues throughout the Fall and Winter, and at this time of year they are extremely busy meeting the colonists coming forward to fill the opportunities previously developed and seeing that they reach their proper

{ [Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

destinations. Our district offices in western Canada are supervised and directed by Mr. C. A. Van Scoy, our Superintendent of Colonization at Winnipeg, who is in charge, under direction from headquarters, of our department in western Canada. Mr. Van Scoy, from our Winnipeg sub-headquarters, also directs the activities of our western United States offices. With headquarters in Winnipeg, our Department also maintains the Canada Colonization Association, which is organized for the purpose of placing incoming families without capital, or with limited capital, or with capital, upon privately owned lands in the Dominion, both improved and unimproved, although their particular activity has been in placing families either without capital or with limited capital upon developed and equipped farms.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. Is that organization still in operation?—A. Yes, sir. Since we took the Canada Colonization Association over exclusively we have located 2,423 families upon farms, and this number of families are now under the supervision of the Association.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Have you under your hand, Mr. Macalister, information as to how they have been distributed as to provinces?—A. I have not that with me, but I can give you an approximate idea. I can get it for you exactly.

By Mr. Spence (Parkdale):

Q. Can you tell us where these families come from originally?—A. The majority of them come from the continent. I would say we located 50 per cent in Manitoba, 30 per cent in Saskatchewan, and 20 per cent in Alberta. That is only an approximation.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. During how many years of operation?—A. Since January 1st, 1925.

By Hon. Mr. Tolmie:

Q. Under what conditions do you settle them on the land—the families without much money?—A. Families without money have been settled on these farms under what is known as the "Joint and several liability contract." The majority of these families have been settled upon farms which have been farmed on a large scale, and perhaps rather indifferently farmed. They are farms of rather large acreage. If a group of from three families up settle on this bloc of land, they all sign the contract, and each family is responsible for the other. That system was brought about by the vendors insisting upon that protection when turning these farms over to the families—not only the farms, but the equipment and live stock.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Am I right, Mr. Macalister, in assuming that your activity along this line of placing families has been directed especially to the western provinces, rather than to Ontario and the East?—A. Yes, particularly in the western provinces up to the present time. The Canada Colonization Association has a branch office at Saskatoon, and a branch office at Calgary, and have now opened a branch at Toronto. Since last Fall there have been a very considerable numbers of families settled in Ontario, and our activities there do not show any sign of decreasing. We expect that will develop into a very considerable movement.

By Hon. Mr. Guthrie:

Q. Are these families settled upon unoccupied farms, or abandoned farms, or what?—A. Both.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Q. What acreage would be granted?—A. From 160 to 320 acres. It varies. It depends on how much land is under cultivation on the farm at the time they go in to occupation.

Q. These families are of a class which has no capital?—A. Not altogether, sir. Some of them have some capital—the more the better.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Has this scheme been successful financially so far?—A. It has been very successful. Our reports, very carefully compiled, indicate that more than 95 per cent of these families show every indication of being ultimately successful.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. From what countries do they come?—A. Germany, Poland, Russia, the British Isles, the Scandinavian countries—

By Hon. Mr. Tolmie:

Q. Do I understand that the individual families in these groups are jointly responsible?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Are any of them Mennonites?—A. A large number of them.

Q. The majority of them are?—A. I believe so.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. How do you locate the families without capital?—A. I have just explained how we did it through the Canada Colonization Association.

Q. You just stated that each individual family unit is jointly responsible with the others. Supposing a family of five comes in without capital: will you select all of those without capital and put them on one bloc?—A. Frequently we are able to group families which come in as individual families into a group for settlement, but we cannot establish an individual family without capital on their own equipped farms, because the vendors would not take them. We can establish individual families without capital in farm employment, and we do establish a large number of them in that way.

Q. I understood you to say you placed families without capital on the land, and you repeated both "with" and "without capital"?—A. Under joint and several liability.

By Mr. Dubuc:

Q. What number of families do you include in a group—three or five?—A. Yes, sometimes more.

Q. Would that group grow up to twenty?—A. Twenty would be a very large group. It is more workable to hold them to a group of from three to five.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. Under a scheme of this kind do you get the people from the British Isles to co-operate?—A. It is very difficult.

Q. I think it is necessary to bring out that it is practically only those people who are accustomed to communal life whom you can get to settle in this way?—A. Not altogether. You can get various continental nationalities to undertake these responsibilities, because they realize that is the only way they can hope to establish themselves upon their own farms upon their arrival here, but it is very difficult to get the Scandinavians or the British to undertake the joint and several responsibility.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

By Mr. Glen:

Q. You say you have been successful in settling these families in Manitoba. You said that this scheme has been in operation since 1925.—A. The Canada Colonization Association has quite a long history behind it. First of all, it was organized as a national movement, then it was administered, I believe, by the Canadian Government, the Canadian National Railways and ourselves. Then the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific administered it, and eventually it was taken over by the Canadian Pacific and we have been carrying on alone since 1925.

Q. Have any of the settlers been able to pay anything on the principal?—A. Very large payments.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. It is really a specific branch of the C.P.R.?—A. It is part of the Department of Colonization and Development of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which we use to the greatest possible extent in establishing families upon the farms.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. What steps do you take to acquire these farms for the settlers who have little or no capital? Do you buy the land?—A. No, we simply act as a go-between for the vendor and the colonist. The Colonization Association does not buy any land, nor does it own any; it acts entirely without compensation of any kind. It cannot retain one penny for the services performed. Every dollar it costs to cooperate the Canada Colonization Association is supplied by the Department of Colonization and Development of the Canadian Pacific.

Q. And you or the Colonization Association exercise some discretion in settling these farmers on a certain piece of land, that is, they advise the settlers as to whether these farms are worth the money that the vendors are asking for them?—A. No settler is sent to any farm until the farm has been thoroughly inspected by the field staff of the Association, and on many occasions is re-inspected by representatives of various organizations working in co-operation with the Canada Colonization Association.

Q. But you would practically advise the settler that in the opinion of your Department the farm is worth the money the vendor is asking?—A. Yes, we would advise the settler that in our opinion he had a good opportunity of being successful upon that particular farm.

Q. Does the Canada Colonization make any profit?—A. It does not make one cent of profit. I want to make that very distinct and very clear, that the Canada Colonization Association does not retain one cent for any of its activities. The cost of operating the Association is paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

By Hon. Mr. Tolmie:

Q. In this communal system of settlement, is it so arranged that the individual may finally become the sole owner of his own farm?—A. Yes. In many of these agreements there is an understanding that after a certain proportion of the purchase price has been paid, the bloc of land will then be split into individual contracts.

Q. That is your ultimate aim?—A. The ultimate aim is that after each of the five families has demonstrated the fact that they are a good agricultural family and are endeavouring to make a success, and treating the vendors honestly, they will be given an individual contract. The joint and several contract constitutes a daily inspection by each member of the group over the other members of the group.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

By Mr. Fansher (Lambton East):

Q. Is this system of colonization somewhat the same as that in vogue in Denmark?—A. I am not familiar with the Danish situation.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. What do you do when one of the group proves a failure? Do you give the group an opportunity of bringing in someone else?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. Mr. Macalister, may I ask if the Colonization Branch of your railway is establishing any farm such as they had at one time at Wilkie and Vanguard?—A. No, they are not, not at the present time.

To indicate how closely the Association is a part of our Department, when we took it over we placed Mr. T. O. F. Herzer from our own staff—he had been in our Department, I think, since 1914, and had been very active in all our various activities in the west, as well as in the United States and had been thoroughly trained in the Department—in charge as manager of the Association. The Association is administered by Colonel Dennis as President, Mr. P. L. Naismith, formerly of our Department of Natural Resources, as Vice-President, and its activities are supervised and managed by an executive committee of the Board of Directors consisting of the officers, together with Mr. D. C. Coleman, Vice-President of Western Lines, Mr. F. W. Russell, of our Lands Department in Winnipeg, and Mr. Gerow of our Lands Department in Saskatoon and Mr. C. A. Van Scoy of our Department, Winnipeg. I may say that members of the executive committee which actually meet monthly to supervise its affairs are Mr. Coleman, Mr. Russell, and Mr. Van Scoy, our superintendent of Colonization at Winnipeg, Mr. Herzer as Manager, attends.

Now, of course, the Association is constantly, through its headquarters staff, through its branch offices, and through organizations affiliated with it, seeking out new settlement opportunities and trying to have blocs of land prepared prior to the arrival of the colonists to take care of additional families as they come in, and at the present time we are in a position to receive and place under the system I have just described 1,400 families.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. On privately owned land?—A. On privately owned land, sir. The Association does not deal in anything excepting privately owned land. I mean by that, land either owned by an individual or a corporation.

Q. In every case the individual or the corporation has to supply the funds, where the settler cannot supply his own?—A. Of course, Mr. Stewart, that would vary. It is quite true, that is where the settler cannot supply his own.

Q. I mean in every case, the owners of the properties take the chances on the contracts? No money is supplied by the railway or anybody else?—A. Not a dollar.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. Are Canadians given an equal opportunity or any opportunity, the same as you have described?—A. Yes, there is no reason why we would not take care of a group of Canadians if they would come and sign the same contract which the vendors insist upon being signed.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You do not ask them to sign the contracts?—A. Not as principals; we act for the vendors.

Q. You are intermediaries between the vendors and the proposed settlers?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Tolmie:

Q. Under this system do you carry on very much the same system of farming as is done by others, such as dairy farming, beef cattle and so forth?—A. That varies with the district and the character of the particular farm. Some farms are suitable for dairy farming or for beef cattle, or grain farming. It all depends on the district.

Q. I presume most of these farms would be suitable for one particular line in a certain district?—A. Yes.

Q. Then your aim is to rather encourage a certain line of farming?—A. You mean the families of one group to carry on a certain line?

Q. Yes?—A. Yes, we do.

Q. I am thinking of the opportunity for installing creameries, for instance, and to co-operate in the selling.—A. Of course, the vendors are particularly anxious to make every effort to have their groups undertake diversified farming.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Do you keep men in the fields to inspect these colonists which you settle?—A. Yes.

Q. How often do they make that inspection?—A. That varies. If they are having a very difficult time, probably once a week; if everything is going on nicely and smoothly, perhaps not more than once every two or three months.

Q. How long do you keep this up?—A. Until the group has indicated they are on their feet and everything is all right, and on the way to success.

By Hon. Mr. Tolmie:

Q. Are these inspectors also instructors?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Do you settle them on C.P.R. lands?—A. No.

By Mr. MacKenzie:

Q. Does one inspector inspect the land and also the equipment, or have they different inspectors?—A. Well, that is a difficult question to answer, because the vendors are particularly interested in the stock and equipment, and many of the vendors for whom we have settled large areas of land, are able to keep an inspector of their own, or have an inspector of their own drop around occasionally, looking after the stock and equipment.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. Have you any offices soliciting the immigration of eastern Canadians to such lands?—A. Our Department feels that it is not properly one of our functions to move colonists or farmers from one province of the Dominion to another.

Q. That is not my question. You have the machinery.—A. I will answer your question by saying No, sir.

By Hon. Mr. Tolmie:

Q. How many of these are in British Columbia, and where are they located?—A. I know we have a settlement in the Okanagan Valley, but I am afraid I will have to plead inability to answer your question fully, because I do not keep in touch with those close details.

Q. But you have some in British Columbia?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. Let us get this matter cleared up. Have you ever dealt individually with any of the eastern Canadian farmers to put them on the Western lands under this agreement?—A. Not that I know of.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Q. Have you any machinery in eastern Canada through which you are encouraging the immigration of the eastern Canadians under this agreement?—
A. To the west?

Q. Yes.—A. In our Department?

Q. Yes.—A. No, sir.

By Mr. Motherwell:

Q. You give special freight rates—or you formerly did?—A. That is not in our department.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. In your opinion would not the eastern Canadian—we will say the northern French Canadian habitant make an ideal type for grouping? Have they not developed the communal life to a high degree, and would it not be possible for them to undertake this form of settlement?—A. It is quite possible, sir, but you must understand that we have been extending the activities of the Canadian Colonization Association gradually. It has been branching out. As I mentioned a short time ago, we have come into Ontario, and I may say that the Maritime Provinces are on our backs constantly trying to get us down there, and we expect to go as soon as we can extend to that extent. You will appreciate that these things have to progress more or less slowly.

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. The object of your association is to bring immigrants to Canada? You are not interested in interprovincial transplantation?—A. Not at all.

Q. Your primary object is to bring immigrants to Canada?—A. To assist to the fullest possible extent in the settlement of Canada.

Q. You are not interested particularly in taking people from Ontario and planting them in the west, or in the Maritime Provinces?—A. No. Now, there is one other branch of our department upon which I would like to touch. I have referred to affiliated organizations. There are, at the present time, 25 major colonization associations in various parts of the Dominion co-operating with our department. In the colonization activities, to which I have referred, they are co-operating with us. I refer to them as major organizations because their activities either extend throughout a province or throughout several provinces. The headquarters of the 25 are located four in Alberta, eight in Saskatchewan, seven in Manitoba, six in Ontario, three in Quebec. In addition to that, we have 138 local colonization boards affiliated with the department.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Can you file a list of the 25 major ones?—A. I could, yes, but I cannot to-day. Of these 138, two are located in British Columbia, 36 in Alberta, 58 in Saskatchewan, 24 in Manitoba, 15 in Ontario, 1 in Quebec, 1 in New Brunswick and 1 in Nova Scotia.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Who finances these various organizations?—A. They either finance themselves to some considerable extent, or receive assistance from our department. These local boards are formed by public spirited citizens in their respective districts, men who recognize and realize that their districts cannot reach the ultimate of prosperity until the agricultural lands available are brought under cultivation and developed. They consist of bankers and merchants and farmers, organizing themselves into local boards, prepared to do what they can to help in the development of their own districts.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. Especially in the distribution of settlers?—A. They make a survey of the settlement opportunities in their district, farms which are available for sale or for rent or on assisted settlement terms. They carry on a campaign amongst the residents of the district and get them to get in touch with their friends or relatives in the United States, or on the British Isles, or on the continent, who may be induced to come forward and settle in their districts. They get from the farmer applications for the farm help that they require, or for domestic servants. These applications, and these nominations, and this information, which they have gathered is sent to our district office in the particular district in which they may be situated, and by us is passed on in the regular routine of the department.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Mr. Macalister, these organizations to which you have referred are not being conducted with any view to financial gain to the members comprising them?—A. Not at all. It is a voluntary service. They not only perform the functions I have described, but when colonists come forward to fill the opportunities obtained, they receive them and assist in their distribution. They do that in various ways. We reimburse them for part of the expense or actual money outlay, but there is no intention of personal profit in the plan. If I may, I will just branch from our own department for a moment. Under the so-called Continental Railway agreement, which has been referred to at the meetings of this committee, our department deals with all nominations for colonists from so-called non-preferred countries. Our steamship organization, the steamship passenger department, assists in the obtaining and gathering and transmits to our department nominations of that character. Our station agents throughout both the eastern and western lines also assist us, and they are in very close touch with the farmers of the community. They accept applications and nominations and forward them to our department. That is not merely a passive assistance. I went to the trouble of getting a list of our active agents in Saskatchewan, and there are 215 station agents in the Province of Saskatchewan, who are actively and energetically co-operating with the Department of Colonization and Development.

Now, that covers in a general way our organization in Canada, particularly for the obtaining of settlement opportunities, nominations and applications.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. You just mentioned the nomination plan. Would you mind telling us the terms under which you accept immigrants on the nomination plan? For instance, do you require the farmer nominating an immigrant for transportation to Canada to file with you the number of months he is willing to employ the immigrant, and the rate of pay?—A. Yes. The nomination form covering single men is an established form now, approved by the Department of Immigration and Colonization. The man signing it agrees that he will provide the immigrant with work for one year.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. If a man makes application for a servant or for hired help, and the immigrant comes to this country and the farmer does not take him, what do you do?—A. Get them a job some place else.

Q. You take care of them?—A. Our organization in western Canada, not only sends the man forward to the destination for which he is intended, but if for any reason the employer does not like him, or he does not like the employer, or if for any other reason, he leaves that job and wants another one, our organization, all our district offices and all our travelling staff, are available for replacing that man any time, winter or summer.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. What steps do you take to see that a man arrives at his destination?—

A. When he arrives at the port he is met by our Port Colonization Agent. We also have a corps of colonist conductors who accompany our trains of colonists from the port of arrival to the distributing centres. The majority of the colonists, of course, go west, and they accompany them to Winnipeg. At Winnipeg, they are met by our western organization. Each man has an identification card showing where he is going. They are gathered into groups and placed upon the proper trains to take them to their destination and if the number going to a certain destination is not large enough to justify our sending a conductor to accompany them, the district office in which that destination is located is telegraphed that these colonists are on the train, and they are met on arrival. If one man should be nominated by an individual and put on a train at Winnipeg to go to that individual, we advise that individual of the train he is on and its due arrival time.

Discussion followed.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. I would like to ask one question. I think the witness is endeavouring to show us the method they use for distributing the immigrants who come out under an assisted passage scheme. What method is being taken by the railway to see that these persons get to their destination? It came to my attention last year that quite a number of them were dumped at a siding in the west, with nobody there to look after them. Were any of those facts brought to your attention?—A. I do not know of a single colonist or immigrant who was dumped by the Canadian Pacific Railway or by our Department.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. I think you will perhaps remember the situation which took place in Calgary last spring when there was a large number of Austrians brought over by the Canadian Pacific Railway and left on the hands of the city. Several of them came over under the nomination scheme, but the late season prevented them from getting work on the farms. Do you know anything about that?—

A. I do not know of any colonists, for whom we were responsible, that were on the hands of the city; I have no recollection of it.

Q. At that time, the member for East Calgary, for his Board of Trade, sent down a violent protest to the Government to ask if the Canadian Pacific Railway were bringing further immigrants before they settled that situation?—

A. Do not misunderstand me. I am not attempting to deny that there was a congestion of colonists last spring, due to the late season, but I have no recollection of any party of Austrians that were dependent on the city of Calgary for food and lodging during that period, and I do not think there were.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. That is, for which you were responsible?—A. People that we had brought in.

By Mr. Totzke:

Q. This Association, that you are speaking of, does not apply to points on the Canadian Pacific Railway?—A. Oh, yes.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. Can you give us an idea of the percentage of those people who actually stayed on the farm after they got there?—A. It is impossible to give an accurate estimate of the number of single men that stayed on the farm. You cannot follow the single men, unless you put a policeman with each one of them.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Q. You do not know whether they stayed on the farm?—A. I know a very large number of them stayed on the farm. I also know that some of them did not.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Under this nomination scheme, is it part of your contract to guarantee employment for one year to these men?—A. The certificate that is issued by our Certificate Issuing Officers on the Continent, contains this sentence, "Occupation in the service stated is guaranteed by this Company."

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. Would you submit to this Committee the nomination form used by the railway companies and also the certificate to which that refers, and any other documents in connection with it?—A. I believe that has been filed.

Q. What about the certificate?—A. We can file a copy of the certificate.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. It is not very long, and you might read it?—A. There is an agreement stamped on this certificate in the language of the particular colonist to whom it is issued. I have a translation of that here. I do not know who translated it, because it does not read very smoothly. I would like the opportunity of having this translation checked up before it goes into the Minutes of this committee. The certificate reads as follows:—

Original.

No. 31833
(In duplicate)

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY

DEPARTMENT OF COLONIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT

28, 1, 1928.

To the Department of Immigration and Colonization of Canada:—

The bearer Mr. Karpluk Jan, sex F, age 27, of Ksawerówka, Sokal, being of Poland, where signature is endorsed below, belongs to a class whose admission to Canada is provided in P.C. 183 and is proceeding to Canada by ss. *Minnedosa*, scheduling to sail from Liverpool on 10/11, 1928, for the purpose of engaging in farm labour in Canada. Occupation in the service stated is guaranteed by this Company.

Passport vise is hereby requested for the above named.

(Seal)

W. A. DRELEMKZ,

Signature of Certificate Issuing Officer.

KARPLUK JAN,
Signature of Holder.

Office, Warsaw.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. How long has that certificate been in vogue?—A. Since September, 1925.

By Mr. Totzke:

Q. Could you actually deport a man if he did not accept that employment when he came to Canada?—A. I believe so. There would be representations if he did not accept that occupation.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Do you deport him?—A. We do not deport anyone, the Department of Immigration and Colonization do that.

Q. Do you know whether they have deported anyone for misrepresentation?—A. I could not say.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Supposing a farmer is asking for hired help, how do you get his nomination?—A. In various ways. He might write to us and say that he wanted a couple of farm helpers, and we would mail him an application, which he would fill out and return to us. He could get in touch with one of the district officers, fill in an application and hand it to him, he could also get in touch with the various organizations that are affiliated with us.

Q. Do you officers go through the country asking for nominations?—A. You mean, to go out and solicit nominations?

Q. Yes.—A. No.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. In your railway stations, you post signs soliciting applications for nomination?—A. I am afraid you have got applications and nominations mixed up. We refer to an application for farm help where a man makes an application for an unnamed person, and nomination where it covers a named person that they want brought over.

Q. But in your stations in Western Canada, you do actually have notices posted, inviting the farmers to apply for unnamed workers?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. I think you said that some of the officers of the railway companies—I am not saying it is the Canadian Pacific Railway—are getting commissions for nominations?—A. Not officers of the railway, sir, not of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Q. Officers of steamship companies?—A. No, not speaking of an officer as being a salaried employee; no, they do not.

Q. What form of publicity do you use in the newspapers in the Old Country to induce settlers to come to this country?—A. What country?

Q. What advertising do you use in the Old Country to induce settlers to come to this country, and is it framed in conjunction with the Immigration Department?—A. You are speaking of the British Isles?

Q. Yes. Is it framed in conjunction with the Immigration Department?—A. I know we do a lot of advertising in the British Isles, and I am under the impression that our Traffic Department does some advertising.

Q. You advertise in the Scandinavian countries?—A. We advertise in the Scandinavian countries to the fullest extent permitted by the laws of those countries.

Q. And in conjunction with the Immigration Department of this country? Do they know of that advertising, and have they proofs of it?—A. No, it is not submitted to them.

Q. Could you submit to this Committee a copy of the advertising used in the Scandinavian countries?—A. I do not think there is any display advertising in the Scandinavian countries; I do not think it is permitted.

Q. Could you supply copies of the advertising in the British Isles?—A. I presume we would have it in Montreal. I might have to send to London for it.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. I would like to know the regulations regarding an application by a farmer for unnamed help, and how long those regulations have been in vogue?—A. The regulations of the Department of Immigration and Colonization?

Q. No, the application of the Canadian Pacific Railway that is filled out by the station agent, to which you made reference some time ago, where the farmer applies for an unnamed person from Europe as a farm labourer. What regulations govern the filling out of that application, and how long have they

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

been in vogue?—A. I am sorry, but I do not understand what you mean by the regulations governing the filling out of it.

Q. I will give you a case in point. A farmer, with whom I am well acquainted, applied for two Scotch farmers. The Department notified him that this application was accepted, and that they would be on hand by the 30th of March, or the 5th of April. The fifth of April came round, and no help arrived. He communicated with the Department by wire, and, as there was no likelihood of them arriving very soon, he proceeded to get help. In June, these parties arrived, and they turned out to be two men from London, England, that had never seen a horse or a farm, or had never been in Scotland. Now, what regulations govern the farmer making out that application? He carries out his part of the contract morally, and then finds that he is left in the lurch after help has been picked up from the sources available, at that time?—A. Well, I think I can answer that question by saying that we are never able to recruit a sufficient number of farm labourers in the British Isles to fill the applications obtained in Canada.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. These men coming from the countries in Europe, do you put them through a medical examination, and, if so, what is the character of it?—A. Oh, yes, we do.

Q. Can you give us an idea of what examination you put them through?—A. I will read you a paragraph contained in a statement prepared by Mr. William Baird, our Steamship Passenger Traffic Manager and, up to the past thirty days, our Assistant European Passenger Manager. This was prepared at my request, and touches on the medical examination. Mr. Baird has been in intimate touch with conditions on the Continent for a great many years, and his information is up to the minute. I am reading this because he is more familiar with the subject than I am. (Reads):

Every immigrant is medically examined, by a local doctor, in the country of origin, under the direction of the Canadian Pacific. Another medical examination takes place at the Continental port, under the auspices of the Canadian Pacific, by a Continental doctor. Those immigrants who travel to England for embarkation are again medically examined in England, by the Canadian Pacific, by a British doctor. All examinations are thorough, and in case of immigrants being deloused and disinfected, the examination is of a stripped nature. Women attendants are available for the examination of women.

By Mr. Totzke:

Q. Going back to that clause referring to deportation. I understood you to say that if a man came in, under this scheme of yours, to take work as a farm labourer, and did not stay at that work, he could be deported?—A. I did not say that. I am not a lawyer, nor am I an official of the Immigration Department, but I believe that the Act provides for deportation in the case of a man coming into the country through misrepresentation. He signs this statement on that certificate, a statement in his own language stating that he is coming here to enter into the occupation of farm labourer, or domestic. If they are admitted to Canada on that statement, and understanding that that is the only reason they are admitted, if they fail to follow that out, it is misrepresentation. I am not a lawyer, but it looks like misrepresentation to me.

Q. I have a particular case in mind of a man who came into this country—I do not know whether it was under this scheme or not—but he took employment as a farm labourer. He left the farm and went into a little village and started up as a shoe-repairer, and he is making good. Would you consider that man as being liable to deportation?—A. I understand from you that he went on the farm when he first came here?

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Q. Yes.—A. He actually worked on the farm?

Q. I would not say that he worked for any length of time. I think he did go on the farm when he first came here. Would you say that he was subject to deportation?—A. No, I do not think so.

Q. He is making good in a little town as a shoe repairer?—A. I do not think that he is subject to deportation.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. Is your advertising prepared by your Colonization Branch?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Acting in conjunction with the Department?—A. No.

Q. Do the Department of Immigration supervise it?—A. No.

Q. It is done entirely on your own responsibility?—A. Yes.

Q. Is the advertising prepared in Canada or abroad?—A. Our advertising in the United States is prepared in Canada. The advertising we place in Canada is prepared in Canada. The advertising used in the British Isles is prepared at our London Sub-Headquarters.

Q. And your Continental advertising?—A. You cannot advertise in newspapers, on the Continent, except in Holland.

Q. You have just told us that you advertise, as far as you are permitted, in the Scandinavian countries?—A. I said we advertised, but I did not mean that we used newspaper space, because they do not permit it.

Q. Do your branch offices, we will say in Great Britain, refer copies of the advertising sent out in England to your Department here?—A. Before it is placed?

Q. Yes.—A. No. I think I am probably quite correct in saying that almost every year, when that advertising is placed, Colonel Dennis is abroad, and no doubt it is submitted to him.

Q. You have copies of the advertising used in your departmental files?—A. I feel confident that we have.

Q. You will be able to file that?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you give the Committee any idea of the number of men brought in by your department last year who were not placed on farms? For example, those placed in railway work?—A. I could give you that information, sir, but I am sorry I have not got it here.

Q. You can give us that at the next meeting?—A. Yes.

Q. Do not confine that to railway work—I just gave that as an illustration. Let us have the number of persons brought in by you last year, and have them separated according to the employment they took up in Canada.—A. I cannot give you the exact figures, or the exact total of the men that came to Canada under our auspices and who did not go into farm work. I can give you the number that our department placed in other than farm employment, owing to the exceptional season last spring.

Q. You did place a number of continental immigrants in other work than farm work, last year?—A. We did.

Q. That is what I am interested in. If you can give us the approximate number in proportion to the total.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. Does your company consider that they have filled their obligation when they put a man in contact with farm employment?—A. No, sir.

Q. I think you said before that if the first situation was not satisfactory, either to the employer or the man, you would endeavour to make a second arrangement?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. If you do not hear anything about that man, after he has left his first situation, you have no means of tracing him or knowing what he is doing?—A.

Every continental colonist brought to Canada, by our department, is given a pamphlet, in his own language, urging him and telling him that if he needs another job, rather than going hither and thither on reports of places available, to communicate with us. We give a list of the district offices, and say that these offices are at his service.

Q. If he does not communicate with you, you cannot follow him up in any way; you have no means of tracing him?—A. That is a pretty broad statement. Many of them can be traced, and many cannot.

Q. But you do not follow him up and see how far he is fulfilling his obligation, when he expressed a willingness to take up farm employment?—A. We cannot attempt to follow up individuals. If we do not hear from a man wanting further employment, or we do not hear any kicks about that particular man, from the Department of Immigration and Colonization, or from other sources, we feel that he has found his place and that he is all right.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Are you under any obligation to find other employment for those men who do not find farm employment?—A. No, sir.

Q. But you do find them other employment at times?—A. Oh, no, we are only interested in placing them in farm employment.

Mr. GLEN: It is nearly one o'clock, and I presume we will be adjourning. We will probably have the opportunity of hearing this witness again, and I would like this witness to address himself to this question. There is some feeling throughout the country that there is indiscriminate immigration into Canada of help which is not required. For instance, there is the question of farm help after the season of the year has passed. A number of people are brought from the British Isles, or elsewhere, into this country. We can maintain in our own country the labour that is required for, say, the harvest period, and those people coming from these other countries, of necessity, become members of the unemployed. I would like you to address yourself to the question of what relation this indiscriminate immigration into this country has in connection with unemployment, and also in connection with the emigration from this country to the United States. I think there is a general feeling throughout the country that a good deal of the unemployment is caused by people coming in from these countries. The feeling is that the railway companies are in this position, that, when they fulfil their obligation of providing employment for one year, then they divest themselves of all responsibility, and ultimately these people become a charge on the country. The feeling is that where there is immigration, it should be selective immigration of people who are likely to stay in the country and not swell the ranks of the unemployed. I would like Mr. Macalister to address himself to that the next time he appears before the Committee.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): There have been some suggestions made, and made pretty widely, that the colonization agents are not making a sufficient attempt to get immigration from the British Isles. Would Mr. Macalister tell us something about what his department does in regard to getting immigration from the British Isles?

The WITNESS: That is a long story, and I would rather not go into it unless I could do so thoroughly.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I would like you to give us a statement on that question when you are before the Committee at another time.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until Friday, March 23, at 11 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, March 27th, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock, a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: At our last meeting we were examining Mr. Macalister of the C.P.R.

J. N. K. MACALISTER recalled.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Macalister passes on, I would like to clear up, if I may, a matter brought out by a question asked by Mr. Lucas. The question was, "Who finances these organizations?"

The CHAIRMAN: What page is that?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Page 144 of March 21st. Mr. Macalister answered, "They either finance themselves to some considerable extent, or receive assistance from our department." I want to ask Mr. Macalister if that statement should not have been, "They finance themselves to some considerable extent, and receive assistance from our department?"

The WITNESS: That would be more correct, yes, sir.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. I have previously asked you regarding certain organizations in Canada who are not in the thing for profit or personal gain for their organizations, and you said that there were none; but is it not a fact that there are organizations in the west—for instance, the Atlantis Colonization at Regina, which is Hungarian, I believe, and the Ukrainian Organization at Edmonton and Winnipeg, and I think also at Saskatoon—which get paid \$5 on each application they receive for persons coming out?—A. Well, Dr. Edwards, I cannot give you a yes or no answer to that question. I think you have it a little mixed up. If my memory is correct, I was speaking particularly of the local colonization boards when I said that they were not performing this service for personal gain.

Q. But there are such organizations as I have mentioned, such as the Atlantis, out there?—A. Yes.

Q. And the Uranian?—A. Yes.

Q. Do they make cash nominations?—A. Yes.

Q. Do they get \$5 apiece?—A. What do you mean by "cash nominations?"

Q. Do they make nominations of persons to come to this country?—A. No, they do not.

Q. Do they receive a fee for each application?—A. Not applications made by themselves, no.

Q. They are not making any money out of it?—A. That is rather a complicated subject.

Q. If you do not know whether they are or not — —A. I answered your question. I said that they are not making applications themselves. Let me explain that to you. There are organizations and individuals who obtain nominations from friends or relatives living in Canada of people on the continent whom they desire to come forward and join them in Canada. If those individuals

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

complete the nomination and hand it to an individual or a company or an association for the bringing forward of that continental, and he does come forward and joins them, they are paid a commission for their service.

Q. By whom?—A. By the steamship line.

Q. Which is a part of your colonization organization?—A. No, sir.

Q. It is under the C.P.R.—A. We have a steamship department, yes.

Q. Why do you apparently put the steamship lines in a different class from your railway lines in your immigration activities?—A. We do not.

Q. From your answer that they were under the steamship lines, I was under the impression that that is true, so far as the colonization policy is concerned.—A. The Department of Colonization and Development has no connection with either the steamship department or the rail department.

Q. You cannot get along without them in connection with your immigration work?—A. Yes, there are other steamship lines and other railways.

Q. You mean by that of course that the C.P.R. could carry on immigration activities and bring the immigrants out by C.N.R. steamship, for instance, and run them over the C.N.R. lines. Of course, you could, but I doubt if you would.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Has it come to your notice on any occasion that nominations made to bring in immigrants have been found on the arrival of the immigrants to be fictitious nominations, resulting in immigrants being dispersed generally, and not to the names and addresses of the alleged nominations under which they were brought in?—A. Well, I can only say in reply that I cannot name any particular instance at this moment, of which I have personal knowledge, but there is no doubt that that has happened.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. What is the amount paid?—A. On nominations?

Q. Yes.—A. \$5, after the arrival of the colonist in Canada.

Q. Paid by the C.P.R.?—A. Paid by the Steamship Department.

Q. How many of these organizations have you working in the west on that commission basis?—A. I cannot tell you, sir.

Q. Approximately.—A. That is a function of the Steamship Department. The Steamship Department do pay this commission to certain individuals and certain organizations who are interested only in colonization work. That is they are not interested in any other phase of steamship activities other than the bringing forward of colonists or immigrants. Therefore, they pay that commission to them, and they also pay it to their own steamship agents. All other steamship lines do the same thing.

Q. Are not the steamship lines under the general C.P.R. system—the whole big organization of the C.P.R.?—A. Yes.

Q. And any moneys paid out in this way in commissions are really out of the funds of the C.P.R.?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Mr. Macalister, there is no doubt but what these boards have been organized on the railway's initiative?—A. Largely, yes.

Q. There has been no concealment about it?—A. None whatever; we are proud of it.

Q. With the idea of colonization?—A. Yes.

Q. Who is the gentleman who has been acting in connection with your colonization boards in the west?—A. In the west, the whole colonization organization is supervised and superintended by Mr. C. A. Van Scoy, our Superintendent of Colonization at Winnipeg.

(Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.)

Q. Mr. Komer was the first man to do the work of organizing the Colonization boards?—A. No, he was not the first. He was interested in part of our organization at one time.

Q. Did he engage in the work of organizing these colonization boards?—A. Yes.

Q. Then Mr. Williams took it up?—A. You are speaking of Saskatoon?

Q. Yes.—A. Yes.

Q. In Saskatchewan?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Van Scoy— —A. He is Superintendent of Colonization. Mr. Williams reports to Mr. Van Scoy at Winnipeg.

Q. And is it the general arrangement that these organizations are given office space by the Canada Colonization Association?—A. Very, very few of them.

Q. Some are and some are not?—A. Yes.

Q. Is there any allowance made to them for cables, telegrams and so forth? Will you tell the Committee the arrangements between the Canada Colonization Association and these local boards?—A. There are only three or four colonization associations which are functioning directly with the Canada Colonization Association. The only connection between the Canada Colonization Association proper and those boards is that the Association gives them office space and functions in the settlement or the establishment upon farms of families that they have been instrumental in bringing to Canada.

Q. Who have been instrumental?—A. The Colonization Boards.

Q. The local boards?—A. These are more than local boards affiliated with them. They are more or less engaged in a country-wide campaign.

Q. You mean the Canada Colonization Association?—A. No, I mean the Colonization Boards, we will call them, to differentiate from the Colonization Association.

Q. The Canada Colonization Association is the Association you described the other day, which was taken over, if I can put it that way, by the Canadian Pacific Railway?—A. Yes.

Q. The Colonization Boards are boards which were established, largely on the initiative of the Canadian Pacific colonization agents, or Colonization Department?—A. Yes.

Q. In order to assist in placements, and to ascertain what the demand for immigrants would be in the various localities?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is the assistance given by the Colonization Association, or by the Canadian Pacific, direct to these various Colonization Boards?—A. It varies, but, as a rule, I would say that we give them a monthly grant, which is used in defraying the expenses of the Board; we assume the travelling expenses of certain officials of the Board. Now, we will have to branch away from the Colonization Department, and come to the Steamship Department. The Steamship Department pay them a commission upon such prepaid tickets as their organization, throughout the provinces, may obtain for the bringing of colonists from the Continent to Canada. They also pay them a commission upon such nominations as their organization may obtain from friends or relatives in Canada, to bring colonists forward from the Continent, and after they arrive in Canada.

Q. That commission is conditional on the nominee actually becoming an immigrant?—A. Yes, exactly.

Q. Is there any other assistance that the Canadian Pacific Railway gives?—A. No, I think that covers the Boards, in a general way.

Q. Is the Colonization Association, or the Canadian Pacific Railway, connected in any way with the Lutheran Immigration Board?—A. Yes. They have their office in the offices of the Canada Colonization Association, and we assist them in the way I have outlined.

Q. Have you an agent, or a board, at Regina, and, if so, who is in charge?—
A. There is an association at Regina, co-operating with our Department, the Atlantis Hungarian Board, with Dr. Ujvary in charge.

Q. Could you give us an idea of the number of those boards? Are there not fifty, or sixty, or seventy, something like that?—A. If I remember correctly, there are 138 active at the moment.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. I thought you said the other day, that sixty per cent of the immigrant families, that come in and settle in Manitoba are Mennonites?—A. No, I did not say that.

Q. Could you give us a list of the families settled on farms in Manitoba, with the countries from which they come, and the nationalities?—A. I cannot give it to you now; I would have to go to our records for that.

Q. Could you supply a list of the families that are settled on farms in Manitoba?—A. The names of the families?

Q. Yes. Those brought in by your Company?—A. Are you referring to our whole Department, or are you referring to the Canada Colonization Association?

Q. I would presume it would be through your Canada Colonization Association, as well as through your own Company?—A. I think I can give you the number of families right now, for last year. Last year, there were 164 families, settled by the Canada Colonization Association, in the province of Manitoba.

Q. I asked you a question the other day, if you could tell me where the families come from originally, and your answer was that the majority of them come from the Continent. I want to know if you can supply a list of the families settled on the farm, showing the country from which they came?—
A. In Manitoba?

Q. Yes.—A. Yes, I can obtain those figures from Winnipeg.

Q. How does your Company arrive at the number of men that are wanted in any district?—A. By the applications received.

Q. I asked you a question the other day with regard to the payment of five dollars to the Organization, for every application for people coming from the Continent, and one dollar for those coming from the British Isles. Have you addressed yourself to that question, since the last meeting, as to whether that is true or not?—A. I do not remember the question.

Q. I repeat it only as information received, that some of these organizations, if they send applications in to your Company, will get five dollars for every nomination of an immigrant from the Continent, and one dollar for immigrants from the British Isles. Have you any knowledge of that?—A. Well, I explained it a few moments ago. The payment of five dollars on nominations is by the Steamship Department. I am not just sure that I understand your question.

Q. I am told that your agents will ask some of these organizations that have been formed in Manitoba for nominations, and if they provide nominations for immigrants from the Continent they will be paid five dollars, but for nominations from the British Isles they will only be paid one dollar?—
A. If they obtain a nomination from a farmer farming a farm in Canada, and the individual named in that nomination arrives in Canada and goes to the nominator, they are paid a five dollar commission for their service in that connection, by the Steamship Department.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. That is from the Continent, from the so-called non-preferred countries, under the railways agreement.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Q. And if they come from Great Britain, what are they paid in that case?—A. I am not quite positive, but I believe that there is a regulation that for every nominated colonist from the British Isles, coming under the assisted passage rate, there is a commission of \$2.50 paid. The commission is smaller because of the contribution made by the Canadian Pacific Railway to effect the £2 rate. You must understand that this is a steamship matter.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Why should there be a discrimination? You pay five dollars for immigrants from the Continent, and \$2.50, as you say, for those from the British Isles? What is the reason for that discrimination?—A. You are asking me to answer a question that pertains entirely to the Steamship Department. I presume the reason is that the colonist arriving from the Continent pays us an average of from \$125 to \$140 for a ticket, and the colonist arriving from the British Isles pays £2, or \$10; it would seem quite reasonable.

Q. Have you taken the position, in Manitoba, that with these organizations who make the nominations— —A. Pardon me, sir, they do not make the nomination. The only man that can nominate is the farmer farming a farm; the organization cannot nominate.

Q. But, as a matter of actual fact, is it not true that these nominations really come through the organizations that are formed in the particular districts in the provinces; is that not what actually happens?—A. Some of them do.

Q. Is it not the practice for the parties to come to the organization, and the nominations are made by it?—A. No, the majority of them do not come in that way.

Q. Have you any instances of a single individual writing to your company and nominating a person, and getting five dollars for the nomination?—A. No, because we do not pay the individual the five dollars.

Q. Whom do you pay?—A. The Steamship Department pay their agents.

Q. And who are they?—A. Scattered throughout the west.

Q. Are they appointed as secretaries of these organizations?—A. No. The Steamship Department has nothing to do with them. The Steamship Department's agents are men in the steamship agency business through the west, or throughout the east, for that matter.

Q. My information is that agents from the Colonization Department will go through Manitoba and ask that organizations be formed in districts. They are formed and secretaries are appointed, and the secretary gets fifty cents for each nomination, and also gets free transportation in the province, and all nominations come through that organization to this man, who is, in effect, your agent. Is that a true statement of the organization?—A. That is a true statement of part of the organization, part of our Colonization Department, but it is not a true statement of the manner in which nominations reach the office.

Q. But you are admitting that where an organization is formed, and the secretary appointed, in all probability the nominations come through that organization and not through the individual farmers; you admit that that is the practice?—A. Well, it is not a question of admitting it. I will try and explain it to you, if I can. The organization you have described is the local Colonization Board?

Q. Yes?—A. That local board has a secretary, or a Colonization Agent, as we call them. He is the man that looks after the detail work of the local Colonization Board, handles the applications and the office work, and he is more active than the other members. If a farmer wants to bring a friend from the Continent, and there is a local Colonization Board in his neighbourhood, he

naturally goes to the secretary of that Board. He says to that secretary, "there is a man in Poland that I want to bring to Canada, how will I go about it?" The colonization agent of that Board has nomination forms, and he says, "here is the way it is done." He writes up that form and the man signs it. He then goes before a Notary Public and makes an affidavit, and he has it endorsed by a bank manager or a justice of the peace. The colonization agent then sends it to either the district office, or to our sub-headquarters at Winnipeg. Winnipeg sends it down to Montreal, and the Montreal office either approve or refuse it, and from there it goes to the Continent.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. And he gets his five dollars?—A. Goes to the Continental office, and they endeavour to get in touch with the man that is wanted, or the family that is wanted, or the woman that is wanted. If they are successful in getting in touch with that colonist, and the colonist proceeds to Canada, then the Colonization Board is paid the five dollars on that nomination.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. The Colonization Board?—A. Yes; by the Steamship Department.

Q. The local Colonization Board?—A. Yes.

Q. They are paid the five dollars?—A. Yes.

Q. So it might happen that if the local Colonization Board wished to create a fund for themselves they could get as many nominations as they liked, send them in to you, and then you will follow them out, bring in the immigrant, and they will get the five dollars? Do you not see the abuse that is likely to occur with such a procedure?—A. I would, if you could explain to me how they will get as many nominations as they liked.

Q. If the nomination is made, say, from outside of Winnipeg, for a citizen coming from the Continent, a period of two, three or four months is likely to elapse before he comes in, and he is just in the position, as actually does happen, of being simply a labourer. Then you come along and your Colonization Board places him on the farm—you know, you have already said that you do not know where they go—and your duty is then fulfilled?—A. No, you do not understand it, if you will pardon me, sir.

Q. I asked you at the last meeting if you would address yourself to this question: What is the cause of a good deal of the unemployment throughout Canada to-day, and what is the cause of a good deal of the exodus that takes place from Canada to-day, if it is not through immigrants coming in here who are only under your authority for a year, and then go to fill the ranks of the unemployed in the cities?—A. The nomination is not executed, it is not signed, or it is not made by the local Colonization Board; the nomination is made by the farmer farming a farm in Canada. He states that he wants the nominee to come to his farm; he agrees to employ him on his arrival, and the local Colonization Board only enters into it as the instrument through which the transaction is brought about, in having the nominations prepared, ready for the farmer's signature; in passing it on to us, after it is signed, and in assisting in the general work of seeing that the nominee goes to the farmer when he arrives.

Q. Do you place annually, with the same men, immigrants from the Continent? That is, you will get a nomination from A.B. one year, and you get another nomination the following year from the same man; have you any record of that?—A. No, I do not know of any.

Q. Can you make inquiries and find out if the same parties have made nominations, and obtained men, annually; could you find that out from the records of your Department?—A. For how many years back?

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Q. I do not want to go back very far. All I want is the general principle of it. I believe that men are making nominations, get the men out here, and then pay no attention to them, and they go to fill the ranks of the unemployed. I want to find out if the same men are doing it, and thus abusing the practice?—A. In the thousands of nominations that are made each year, there is no doubt that there are some repeats, it cannot be otherwise, but I can say that every possible restriction and care is being taken to see that it does not happen. Our whole organization is bent towards that end, to have that nomination system work on a practical and proper basis.

Q. I believe that is the intention of your Department, but I am anxious to know if the co-operation between your Department, and the Immigration Department, is such that there will be no flooding of this country with men that do not go to work on farms. I want to know if you can give us a list of the men who have made nominations annually for immigrants, say, in the province of Manitoba?—A. Well, I can have our records checked, and see if there were men that made nominations this year, who also made them last year; that is physically possible.

Q. Say, for a period of five years?—A. This has not been in operation for five years.

Q. How long has it been in operation?—A. Since the late fall of 1925; say, 1926 and 1927.

Mr. CAHAN: I would like very much if Mr. Macalister were permitted to address himself to the general questions which were asked by Mr. Glen at the last meeting. I understood that Mr. Macalister was to give us a general statement as to the means employed to secure immigrants from the British Isles.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Macalister has said that when a farmer makes an application to one of the agents, acting for one of these Colonization Boards in the West, that he wants a Pole, we will say, if the man comes out and is placed on the farm, then a commission of five dollars is paid. If he asks for a man from the British Isles, and that man is brought out and placed on the farm, the commission is \$2.50.

The WITNESS: I qualified my \$2.50 statement, Dr. Edwards, by saying that I believed that was correct. That is a steamship function entirely, and something about which I cannot speak positively.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. Would not the same organization, bringing men from the Continent, be also bringing men from the British Isles? Would they be likely to confine themselves to any particular nationality?—A. So far as nominations are concerned, I have tried to make it clear that it is not the organization that brings about the nomination, it is the farmer. The organization accepts the nomination from the farmer desiring a man from the British Isles, or from the Continent.

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. You have stated that the Steamship Department pays that commission to the local Colonization Board. What disposition is made of that, more particularly with regard to the farmer that nominates the immigrant; what proportion of that \$5 fee gets into the hands of the farmer doing the nominating?—A. My best information is that these commissions are expended by the local Colonization Boards in their colonization activities, and that these fees do not nearly cover the ordinary expenses they are put to in receiving and caring for the colonists that come in to their districts.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister]

Q. Your statement is that the farmer who does the nominating of the immigrant, either from the Continent or Great Britain, gets nothing for such nomination?—A. Oh, absolutely, he does not; he gets the Colonist.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Is it not true that previously the fee used to be paid on nominations, and it is only within a year or so that the fee has been paid conditional on the arrival of the immigrant?—A. Our Company never paid a nomination fee until the arrival of the colonist.

Q. Never did?—A. No.

Q. I thought you said there was some condition attached to the immigrant from Great Britain, and also to the immigrant from the Continent, and that it was only since March 1st, a year ago, that the fee was made conditional on the arrival of the immigrant?—A. Not so far as I know, Mr. Ralston.

Q. When you were telling us about these things, I suppose you were telling us what your general instructions were? Do you know, personally, about these matters, or are you telling us what, your general plan is as a working project?—A. I think I am rather familiar with the working of the whole organization. I spent a good many years in the West, as Superintendent of Colonization at Winnipeg, and I had direct supervision over all of these organizations.

Q. And you say that a fee has never been paid on the nomination itself?—A. Not by our Company, sir.

Q. By your Company, by the Steamship Department, or whoever it is pays the fee?—A. When I say, "by our Company," I mean the Canadian Pacific.

Q. Are you sure that nominations are always made by the farmer on written forms?—A. Oh, they must be.

Q. Is it not the practice to ascertain from the farmer, say, by telephone, during the winter, what men he wants, and then to make some sort of a requisition on your Company, without the formality of an actual signature?—A. You are getting away from the question of nominations.

Q. Perhaps I am.—A. That is an application for unnamed persons, as we call it. In that way we arrive at what we call blanket orders, which are sent to our Headquarters in Montreal, and from there to our organization on the Continent. The total is arrived at by the number of applications gathered by our organization in various parts of the Dominion.

Q. The application need not be in writing?—A. When it comes to us, it is in writing.

Q. I am talking about the application from the fellow who is supposed to want the man?—A. I could not say that it must be in writing, but I will say that it usually is in writing.

Q. Have you made an investigation of the various Boards to ascertain if it is in writing?—A. Yes, we have.

Q. Have you not had a good many disappointments? That is to say, the Board would send in a written application to you saying they wanted 150 men, based on the verbal applications which they had received, and then you would find that you were not able to place those men?—A. We have only found that to be the case in exceptional circumstances; it is not at all usual.

Q. What do you mean by exceptional circumstances?—A. One exceptional circumstance was the late season last spring. It was not that the men were not wanted and needed in the particular district, but they arrived at an earlier date than they were required, owing to the lateness of the season. Let me go a little farther back. These men have got to be recruited in the British Isles, or on the Continent, and it takes months, from the time of the application to

the arrival of the colonist. We can only judge, or the applicant can only judge, the probable date at which he will require that colonist.

Q. I suppose the number of applications greatly exceed the number of nominations?—A. Very much.

Q. Do you not think that it would be better to have an actually signed application from the farmer, to give an additional assurance that the proposed immigrant would be placed when he arrived?—A. Well, it would reduce immigration to Canada very materially.

Q. I understand that, but would it not prevent this difficulty of having more people than jobs, when they come to Canada?—A. It would probably result in there being more jobs than there were people.

Q. I am asking you if it would not correct what is complained about, namely, that people who come here are not able to be placed as the Colonization Boards expected?—A. Well, Colonel Ralston, I will say this: if you insist upon an application from a responsible farmer being signed before any effort is made to recruit or bring forward that farm labourer, there certainly will not be any unemployment of farm labour in Canada, because the farmers of the Dominion will not have anywhere nearly the number they require.

Q. Then, you do not think that it is practical to have written applications for farm labour?—A. In all instances, I do not.

Q. In what instances do you think it is?—A. I think it is desirable to get them to the fullest possible extent.

Q. That is the thing which creates the difficulty, namely, the surplus of farm labourers over the number of positions, the fact that the farmer has not made a written application, and there has been a misunderstanding perhaps and the job for which he made application for a man has been filed.—A. I do not think there has been a surplus.

Q. Do you find many Colonists' Boards not taking the quota for which they asked?—A. During the past winter we have not had an application at any of our district offices from men desiring employment on farms to whom we have not been able to give a job on a farm within a reasonable length of time, providing they would work for the going wages for winter employment.

Q. What do you mean by "district offices"?—A. The ones I mentioned the other day, Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Edmonton, Calgary and Vancouver.

Q. You do not mean the Colonist Boards?—A. No, the district offices.

Q. Have you not had a number of Colonist Boards which were not able to absorb anywhere near the number of applications that they sent to the head office? Of course, it would be in the Spring when the men would come.—A. Last spring there were Colonization Boards which could not absorb or place the number of men that they had applied for at the time these men arrived. They were able to place them later.

Q. Are you quite satisfied about that?—A. Yes, quite.

Q. Have you any idea of the number of these men temporarily employed in railway work, who were afterwards placed in farm work, and who are still at farm work?—A. No, I have not.

Q. You have never checked up the percentage?—A. Of the particular men placed in railway work?—A. No.

Q. Of the men for whom farm jobs were not available when they came, and who were placed in temporary work and afterwards placed in farm work: have you any idea of the percentage of these men still in farm work?—A. Almost all of them were placed in farm work, and we have not checked them since to know whether they are still on the farms.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. You have no means of knowing if they are still on the farm?—A. Nor have I any means of knowing that they are not.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. How many single farm workers did your railway and steamship companies bring out in 1927 from the non-preferred countries?—A. I cannot give you the number.

Q. Can you supply that information?—A. I can supply you the number of souls who moved from non-preferred countries to Canada under our occupational certificates, but I cannot tell you the particular proportion of those who came for farm labour.

Q. My question is, can you tell me how many single—that is, unmarried—farm workers were brought out by the C.P.R. railway or steamship lines from non-preferred countries during the year 1927, and can you also inform me how many families were brought out in 1927 from non-preferred countries?—A. That is available from our records, yes.

Q. You do not have it here?—A. No.

Q. Will you take note of that and supply the record with it?—A. Yes.

Q. I would also like to have you give me this information, if you possibly can: How many British farm labourers experienced and inexperienced, did your railway and steamship companies bring to Canada, and also how many families, exclusive of those brought out for settlement under the government's 3,000 family scheme, did you bring out? You will see from these two questions and from those I asked at first that one applies to the Continent and other applies to the British Isles, and I am sure that my object is apparent to you. I understand you have not that information under your hand?—A. I have not.

Q. You can obtain it.—A. It must be available from our records.

Q. How did the British farm workers that you brought out turn out? That is, how satisfied were they to conform with the settlement arrangements that you made for them? If you made settlement arrangements for them to go on the farm, did they conform fairly well to them, or did they show a disposition after getting here not to conform with the original idea of bringing them out? Did they disappear or show a disposition not to carry out that end of the arrangement?—A. You are speaking of the British?

Q. Yes, the British farm workers.—A. Oh, I would say that by far the greater majority of them went into the employment for which they were brought out.

Q. There would be some who floated away, of course?—A. Yes, some. There must be some leakage.

Q. Did you bring out as many farm workers last year from Great Britain as you desired?—A. We brought all we could obtain.

Q. Could you have found places for more if you could have obtained them?—A. Yes, sir. I will say that we brought all the experienced and partly experienced men that we could obtain.

Q. How many families do you expect to bring out this year from the British Isles?—A. I cannot tell you, now.

Q. Are you having any difficulty in recruiting in the British Isles? Do you meet with any difficulties over there?—A. Lots of them.

Q. Perhaps an answer to this question will give me an answer to another. What, in your opinion, stands in the way of British emigration to Canada? You say that you are meeting with lots of difficulties there in connection with a large number of British people.—A. In making the statement that we are meeting with lots of difficulties, I refer to the fact that when you go to solicit colonists in any country you meet with lots of difficulties. It is hard work.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Q. What, in your opinion, stands in the way of getting British immigration to Canada? Are there any outstanding things that face you as impediments, which could be removed? For instance—and perhaps I can make myself more clear—take the case of a man who has been a farm worker on a farm in England and who has been attracted by the literature and propaganda concerning this country, and he wants to come to Canada. Does he have to get references? I understand that he has to get two references from former employers.—A. I believe so

Q. That would be one difficulty?—A. It might.

Q. He would not want to go to the man for whom he was working at the time and ask him for a reference, or probably he would be entirely out of a job. That would be one difficulty. Then, in regard to the medical examination: do any of them complain about that? Are there difficulties in that regard?—A. The present medical examination has been in effect slightly over thirty days, and I personally am not familiar with it.

Q. Yes, it has hardly been in effect long enough to test it thoroughly, but under this scheme a man is examined medically, and then he is examined again at a different time for his civil examination. They do not take place at the same time, by the same person?—A. I believe they take place sometimes at the same time, and sometimes at different times.

Q. Would that not be a difficulty, in your opinion? Supposing a man is a working man and has to get leave from his job and go and take the civil examination. Then he has to get leave to take his medical examination, and has to take his family with him, his wife and children, taking the children from school, and all that sort of thing. Are those not difficulties which might be overcome?—A. That is a broad question. I know what you are after, Doctor. Mr. Chairman, might I answer that in my own way?

The CHAIRMAN: I think so.

The WITNESS: When I was here before I described to you our manner of getting together applications and nominations for colonists, and I think I moved them down to Montreal. Now, we could move them to London. I would like, first of all, to have given you an idea of the organization we have in the British Isles for obtaining colonists. We have the applications and the nominations from residents in Canada for people, agriculturists they desire brought from the British Isles. We have the organization to get in touch with the people in the British Isles. We have obtained inquiries by various means—large numbers of them. It becomes a matter of salesmanship. If I might use an ordinary expression I believe that we all know that the agriculturists of the British Isles are not “falling over each other” in an effort to get to Canada. We have to persuade them to come to Canada; we have to sell Canada to them; we have to sell the idea of their going to Canada and we have to sell the advantages to be obtained by migrating to Canada. The members of our staff call on the inquirers and endeavour to do what I have told you, that is, to convince them that it is to their advantage to go to Canada, and they finally get them to the point where they say, “Yes, we will go to Canada,” and they sign the application. That brings you squarely up against this contentious subject of medical and civil inspection, and what I want to say on this subject is not said in any sense as a criticism of any man, or any set of men, or any department. Any suggestion I may make is made purely as a constructive suggestion and emanates from my long experience in this work. I have spent the last twenty-one years of my life in trying to induce colonists to come to Canada, and I want to say this, that just as you reduce the time between the time that the man signs his application or says that he wants to come to Canada, and the time that he is civilly and medically examined, and you tell him he can go—to that extent you are increasing the percentage of the men who come.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. That is exactly the point I am after— —A. I presume, in view of the fact that the present arrangement has been in effect for only slightly over thirty days, it is more or less only being tried out and is subject to revision. I make that suggestion from my experience as a way in which conditions may be improved. If you shorten the time, it will help.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. You mean when the notion is still with them?—A. Exactly.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. My information is—and correct me if I am wrong—that in the case of Australia there is less “red tape”, if I may use that expression, that is, that the time between the application being received and the whole thing dealt with and the man ready to go on the boat, is in the case of Australia very, very much less than in those coming to Canada.—A. You are going beyond me, Doctor; I do not know.

Q. I understand, for instance, there is only one reference required.—A. I don't know.

Q. The point in my mind, Mr. Macalister, is this; that just as you extend the time, with the medical examination one time and the civil examination at another time, and then the reference of the whole matter down to London to the head office, and the time coming back, keeping the applicant in a state of suspense—as you lengthen out that time you are adding red tape to the whole business and decreasing the chance of getting that man. It seems to me that the shorter the time between his application and the time that you can get him on the boat, or knows he is going, the more you will favour immigration. My own view is that there is too much red tape, which I believe could be considerably lessened.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. I would like you to tell me what the qualifications are for a farm labourer.—A. You mean what a man must be?

Q. There has been a good deal of talk this morning about bringing out farm labourers. How do you decide a man is a farm labourer? Must he have any qualifications?—A. A man is a farm labourer who wants to work on a farm and is physically able to do so.

Q. Whether he had ever been on a farm or not?—A. Well, in that case he would be a “would-be” farm labourer.

Q. Then all the qualification that is necessary is for him to say that he wants to work on a farm?—A. Oh, no.

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. You do not take him out to see whether he can plough, or shear sheep?—A. Do you want the qualifications of an experienced farm labourer?

By Mr. Coote:

Q. No, I want to know what you mean when you say that a man is a farm labourer. I understand you bring people out here because you have applications for farm labourers. How do you know that these people are farm labourers?—A. My definition of a farm labourer would be a man who is working or has worked on a farm for wages.

By Mr. Glenn:

Q. For how long?—A. A month.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

By Mr. Coote:

Q. May I ask you another question? Are all these people who are brought out as farm labourers able to meet the qualifications you have just stated?—
A. No, because we have many applications from people willing to accept inexperienced men as farm labourers.

Q. Then, would it not be right to say that the only qualification you require from them is to have them say that they are willing to work on a farm?—A. No, I would say the qualification we require is that they meet the qualifications demanded by the applicant.

By Mr. Glenn:

Q. Mr. Macalister, in regard to immigrants coming from the Continent: are all these immigrants on nomination or application?—A. Both.

Q. I think you said the other day that you would endeavour to get some of the advertisements which were put out on the Continent. Have you been able to get them?—A. No, I said we were not permitted to advertise on the Continent.

Q. Do you advertise?—A. Not on the Continent, except in Holland. I presume you mean newspaper advertisements?

Q. Yes. You do that?—A. Not on the Continent, except in Holland.

Q. In the Scandinavian countries?—A. I believe I can say no to that. We may be permitted to use some certain forms of newspaper advertising in certain Scandinavian countries, but as a rule we are not permitted.

Q. You do advertise in Great Britain?—A. Yes, I have a bundle of those here.

Q. Will you file them?—A. Yes.

Q. In regard to those coming from the Continent, how do they get their applications or nominations confirmed? Is it done by your office there?—
A. You are speaking of non-preferred countries?

Q. Yes.—A. These nominations are either approved or refused at the headquarters in Montreal.

Q. How do you arrive at the number of men annually required in Canada? You have your nominations from Canada and know these are to be placed?—
A. Yes.

Q. Are there not a great many people for whom there is no nomination?—
A. Yes.

Q. How do you arrive at the number required?—A. We start in about the 1st of October and make a careful survey, and start out our various organizations and staffs to accept applications and get in touch with various means of placing farm labourers, and we finally arrive at an approximate number. We never arrive at a definite total figure. The requisitions are sent overseas from time to time, as the various numbers are arrived at here.

Q. You set your organization to work to secure the number of immigrants to come to this country?—A. Yes.

Q. Is any communication given to the Department of Immigration as to the results at which you arrive, and as to what you think the necessities for Canada are?—A. So far as the British colonists are concerned, yes. We are in conference constantly with the Department of Immigration and Colonization, but if you mean to ask if we go to them and say that we are going to bring in a certain number of men from the Continent during the year 1928, I would say no.

Q. There is no payment made to anybody on the Continent for immigrants?—A. In some Continental countries, not our Department, but our steamship department pay a commission to the local agents for gathering up and handling these men.

Q. The same way as they do in this country?—A. I do not know what the commission is over there.

Q. But there is a payment made?—A. In a majority of the Continental countries, there is not. I believe that only in Roumania, and possibly in Jugo-Slovakia—but I am not positive of that—our steamship department may use commission agents to some extent, but I think in the other non-preferred countries, they are prohibited by law.

Q. Is the nomination made by the residents in Europe or only by residents of this country?—A. There are no nominations made in Europe.

Q. There are only the applications?—A. There is the application of the man who wants to come to Canada, who comes to our office and says that he wants to go.

Q. Where is the \$5 paid?—A. On the Continent?

Q. Yes.—A. It is paid to the steamship agent to whom he goes. In Roumania, I know the steamship department use commission agents. The Colonist who wants to come to Canada might go to that steamship office and if, after going through the usual routine, he was finally accepted and bought a ticket to Canada, the commission agent would obtain a commission on that ticket.

Q. As a general proposition—supposing there are applications from men in Europe who wish to come to Canada, and they are dumped down in Canada, having fulfilled the requirements for entry: would that not mean that there would be an overflow of these for the jobs which were likely to present themselves in Canada? I asked you at the last meeting if you would address yourself to this question as to whether or not the overflow which you are bringing into this country has not a considerable effect on the unemployment in this country.—A. To start with, in your question you are assuming something that does not happen, because no matter how many colonists there are on the Continent who may make application to our steamship department to come to Canada—speaking of non-preferred countries—none can come until they have passed our Certificate Issuing Officer—in speaking of “ours”, I mean our Department of Colonization and Development—and can convince them that they are of the proper class to fill the applications which are available, and are sent forward only with his consent to fill those applications.

By Mr. Totzke:

Q. And you bring no immigrants from the non-preferred countries except those for which you have either applications or nominations?—A. What do you mean by “applications”?

Q. You have a certain number of applications for farm labourers from non-preferred countries?—A. What do you mean by “applications”?

Q. A farmer would take an application to your Colonization Board, saying he wants a man on his farm, and you place that with other applications and send them to the head office, and they govern you as to the number you are to bring from the non-preferred countries?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. You do not bring in any except the number covered by the applications?—A. The number which are covered by applications, but if you are asking me to say that we have in our hands a signed individual application for each man—

By Mr. Totzke:

Q. No, I don't mean that.—A. No? All right.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Q. The idea is that you have a certain number of applications for farm labourers gathered by your local board, say, a thousand, then you would bring no more than the thousand?—A. That is quite right.

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. Does your Association receive any grant from the Immigration Department for carrying on this work?—A. No.

Q. You are financed in what way?—A. By the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Q. Does the Canadian Pacific Railway receive any grant from the Immigration Department?—A. No.

Q. You receive a return, for the expenses you are put to in connection with colonization, in an indirect way, by having the settlers on your own lands, or on your own lines?—A. By building up the agricultural districts along our lines.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. They will be prospective freight producers?—A. Exactly.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. The question was asked you a while ago as to whether the farm labourers you brought out were satisfactory, and I think you said that they were in general. I wonder if you have any means of ascertaining that, or just how much information you have on that point?—A. Well, the ones that are not satisfactory, we hear about.

Q. A case was brought to my attention this winter—I may say that it is not, by any means, a new one—where six men were trying to find refuge in one of the railway pumphouses—that is a place that is always warmed up in the wintertime. These men were all brought in last year by the railway, as agricultural workers. They claimed that they could not get any work, and I think, probably, they were right. In your opinion, are cases like that unavoidable, if we are to have sufficient agricultural workers?—A. Well, yes, broadly speaking, those instances must occur if we are to colonize this country. I think that those men would be there, not because there was no work available, but because of their inability to understand or speak our language, and their strangeness in the country. They were unable to get in touch with any possible work.

Q. A great many of them are not really competent agricultural workers, and in slack seasons they are the ones that find it difficult to get employment. Does that agree with your opinion?—A. Are you speaking of British colonists, or Continental?

Q. Both.—A. I do not think that there are many Continental colonists coming in that have not had experience in agricultural work. There is no doubt that some slipped through, but I think the number is very small. They were strange to our farming methods, and, of course, they are not as competent farm help as the man that has farmed, or has been a farm labourer, in Canada for a period of years.

Q. And they cannot speak English?—A. Many of them cannot.

Q. That is a handicap, is it not?—A. It must be.

Q. Would you maintain that there are as many jobs for farm labourers in the wintertime as there are in the summer or fall, and if there are not as many, is it not true that there is going to be unemployment in the wintertime, if they are only capable of accepting jobs as farm labourers?—A. Well, of course, we all know that there are more farm jobs in the summertime in Canada than there are in the wintertime, particularly during the harvest season. Many of these men are able to bridge the period between late fall and early spring by going into the woods.

Q. I think you made the statement that there should be no unemployment for farm labour. I would like you to square those two statements up, if possible?—A. I do not remember saying that.

Q. I am pressing this point, because instances are continually coming to my attention, and I am powerless to do anything in regard to them. It is just the case I mentioned a few moments ago, they are out of employment, and are trying to get shelter in pumphouses, or farmhouses, or some place, during the winter time. It is really a case of hardship, as these poor fellows are really not competent to hold a job.—A. I can only answer that question by saying, as I said a few moments ago, that if these men, during this past winter, had got in touch with one of the officials of our Department, or with one of our District Offices, they would have been provided with farm work.

Q. If cases like that are brought to my attention in the future, and I bring them to the attention of your District Office, will you see that they are given employment?—A. I will see that every possible effort is made to give them employment, and I think I can almost promise you that they will be given employment.

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. There is one point that I think should be cleared up, in justice to yourself and the institution you represent. You mentioned that a commission of \$5 was paid for Continental immigrants, and only \$2.50 for British. There is a business principle in connection with this. For the Continental immigrant, who pays about \$130 for his fare, you pay \$5, or about four per cent. For the British immigrant, you pay \$2.50 on a fare amounting to about \$10, or twenty-five per cent. Nobody can say that you are opposed to the British immigrant, or that you are putting any obstacle in their way?—A. We are exerting twenty times the effort, and, paying, I think, twenty times the money to get colonists from the British Isles, than we are to get colonists from the Continent. This matter of commissions on nominations, or commissions on tickets, from the British Isles, is purely a Traffic Department matter, and is something that the Colonization Department have nothing to do with.

Discussion followed.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. I would like you to tell me, if you know, how many immigrants were brought out last year, under the designation of farm labourers?—A. Some gentleman has asked me to supply that information, and I have agreed to do it.

Q. Do you not bring out some thousands of farm labourers every year, and expect them to be absorbed in Canada?—A. Yes.

Q. I wonder if you have any idea of how many we are able to absorb each year?—A. Those that we receive applications for.

Q. The farming industry in Canada is not expanding very fast, is it?—A. Well, it seems to be making some progress.

Q. What will become of all the labourers brought out this year? Will they be held over until next year?—A. Some of them will be held over as labourers, and some of them will get located on farms, or homesteads.

Q. It seems to me that the number we are bringing out would go to prove that the great bulk of these people do not remain as farm labourers, they go off somewhere else. You bring in, very often, inexperienced people, under the designation of farm labour, to take the place of those who have gone; is that not true?—A. Take the place of whom?

Q. Take the place of the ones you brought out, perhaps, two years before, and who have now gone into the towns and cities?—A. They may have gone on homesteads or farms of their own.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Q. Of course, we can find that out. Do you know how much your Company has spent on immigration during the last three or four years; do you know how much they spend per year?—A. Our Company?

Q. Yes.—A. I know exactly what we spent last year.

Q. Would you care to give us those figures?—A. It was published in our Annual Report yesterday. Seven hundred and fifty-one thousand, and some odd dollars.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. That includes all the ramifications of your Department?—A. That is the Department of Colonization and Development.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Could I refer to the question I asked some time ago, as to what measures are being taken to bring colonists and settlers from Great Britain. We have been confining ourselves, almost entirely, to the Continental countries, and I have waited patiently while others have asked questions?—A. We maintain sub-headquarters of our Department at London, England, in charge of Major A. E. Moore, our European Colonization Manager. Major Moore has been associated with our Department since 1907, I believe. Previous to that time he had had long Canadian experience. He visits Canada very frequently, usually once a year, to keep in close touch with affairs here. In addition to our sub-headquarters at London we maintain a district office at London, to deal intimately with the territory in that district. We also maintain district offices at Liverpool, Glasgow, and Belfast. Each of these offices is in charge of men who have spent a great many years with our Department in colonization activities, and who have each had considerable Canadian experience and are thoroughly familiar with conditions in Canada. Each office has its usual office staff, and a field staff. Under our London sub-headquarters we maintain a boys' section, in charge of Major W. H. Hayward, for the recruitment of what is commonly known as "teenage boys". We maintain a women's section, in charge of Mrs. Waite, for the recruitment of domestics. Mrs. Waite has under her direction assistants at each of the district offices. At our London sub-headquarters we also maintain a publicity agent, who deals with advertising and publicity in the British Isles, and in such portions of the Continent as is permitted. We maintain an exhibit truck, with a permanent exhibit, in charge of a lecturer. That truck is on the road, probably, nine or ten months in the year, travelling constantly from town to town, and from marketplace to marketplace, showing the exhibits and the moving pictures that accompany it. Lectures are given by the lecturer on the advantages of Canada. In addition to that organization of our own Department, our Traffic Department maintain eleven district offices in the British Isles, and under those district offices, there are some twenty-five hundred agents. They function with our Department, to the extent that any prospective agricultural colonists, that they come in contact with, are dealt with through us. We have the advantage of their activities in getting in touch with prospective agricultural colonists for the Dominion. As I said a short time ago, after we know the number of each class of colonists that we want, our London sub-headquarters are advised, our district offices and their staffs are advised. We also have the inquiries received from newspapers advertising, from agents, from the traffic officers, and from the lecturers, and our organization goes out and gets in touch with the inquirer, and endeavors to induce him to come forward to fill an application for settlement in Canada. In addition to the above mentioned activities, I might say that each fall and winter we send a number of special lecturers to the British Isles from Canada. They carry on intensive lecturing campaigns throughout the country, in an effort to interest colonists in coming to Canada.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister]

Q. Do a number of those who are brought in under the auspices of the Canadian Pacific, from Great Britain, come in under the Three Thousand British Family Scheme? Is that scheme being operated in connection with the Canadian Pacific?—A. We have brought forward a large number of families for that scheme.

Q. Outside of that scheme, is there any other scheme, whereby provision is made for assisting those who come from Great Britain to settle on farms in Canada?—A. You mean, arranging settlement placements for them here?

Q. Do these people, that you are bringing outside of the Three Thousand British Family Scheme, do they pay their own passage and railway fare, and merely get settlement through the instrumentality of your Department, or is some provision made for assistance in respect of passage?—A. If they are coming to settle upon farms, or for domestic employment, or coming as farm labourers, and have been approved by the Department of Immigration and Colonization for the assisted passage, they receive the £2 rate.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. They come in under the assisted rate?—A. Yes, the assisted passage rate.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Outside of the Three Thousand British Family Scheme, what form of assistance is given to immigrants from Great Britain?—A. They receive this reduced passage rate.

Q. What are the reduced rates that the Canadian Pacific provides for those coming in outside of the Three Thousand British Family scheme?—A. The Empire Settlement rate, the £2 rate—I believe that is the technical term for it—is the rate arrived at by contributions from the British Government, the Dominion Government, and the Steamship Lines.

Q. But outside of this Three Thousand British Family Scheme, where the rate is provided by contributions from the British Government and the Canadian Government, is there any other form of assistance given to British immigrants coming to this country?—A. In the way of reduced rates?

Q. Yes.—A. That reduced rate does not apply only to the Three Thousand Family Scheme; it applies to agricultural colonists approved by the Department of Immigration and Colonization, and to domestics.

Q. Who contributes to support that rate, outside the Three Thousand British Family Scheme? A. The British Government, the Dominion Government and the Steamship Lines.

Q. Under the arrangement at present existing between the British Government, the Steamship Lines and the Canadian Government, is there any limit to the number who are given assisted passage?—A. No, I do not believe so, so long as they comply with the regulations and pass inspection.

Q. And, under the regulations, must they be destined for farm settlement, or farm labour alone?—A. Or domestic service.

Q. Or domestic service?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Outside of those coming in under the British Family Scheme, and outside of those coming in, as you have just stated, for farm labour, farm settlement, and domestic service, are there reduced rates given to other immigrants?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. From Great Britain?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. They pay the ordinary steamship rate?—A. So far as I know.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. You stated a moment ago that the Canadian Pacific Railway spent seven hundred thousand dollars last year?—A. The Department of Colonization and Development of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Q. Does that include the settlement on the land, and everything else, and your expenses in connection with this co-operative understanding you have with the Colonization Boards, and so on?—A. Yes.

Q. It includes everything?—A. It does not include the commissions that have been frequently referred to, the commissions on nominations.

Q. Can you give us the proportion of that amount that is spent on British immigration, for the United States, and on Continental immigration?—A. I could have our auditors go through the statement and dig that out, I suppose; it would be a long job.

Q. You have not got the information with you now?—A. No.

Q. It would be too much trouble to get it?—A. Well, it would mean a lot of work.

Q. You stated some time ago that advertising was carried on in the countries where you are allowed to advertise. Some countries prohibit you in that respect, and do you issue pamphlets in those countries, or circulate literature?—A. That can be answered in a general way. In the Scandinavian countries, for instance, we do issue pamphlets in their own language. In all countries where we are permitted to issue pamphlets, we do so.

Q. Would you have any of those pamphlets available for filing?—A. I will be glad to supply them, provided we have them here. They are prepared on the other side, and if we have any in Montreal it would be because samples had been sent over. I can get them from London, if you want them.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. Supposing a farmer makes an application to your office here for help, and you supply him with that help, is there any commission accepted on the part of the farmer?—A. On the part of the farmer?

Q. Yes. Supposing a farmer applies to one of your offices for help, and you are able to fill that application, is any commission accepted from him?—A. No.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. I would like you to be a little more specific as to the amount of effort that your Department puts forward in the British Isles. It has been stated, on many occasions, in Western Canada, that there was not much effort being made to bring settlers from the British Isles. I would like to have you state just exactly how far you are concerned in this matter?—A. I can tell you, very briefly, in connection with the non-preferred Continental countries. Our Department maintain, in each non-preferred country, an official called a Certificate Issuing Officer. That is the only official maintained by our Department in that country. The colonists present themselves, or are presented to that official. He examines them as to their qualifications, for the class under which they desire to go to Canada, and either approves or refuses them, so far as our Department is concerned. They are then prepared to be presented to the Government Visa Officer, for visa of their passports, or for civil examination. That is the extent of our organization in the so-called non-preferred countries.

Q. And what about Great Britain?—A. I have given you a brief outline of what our organization is. It is a large organization, and it costs a lot of money. We are exerting every possible effort to solicit and sell the idea of going to Canada, to the classes of people in the British Isles that we are prepared to accept.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. I think you made that general statement that you were putting forth twenty times the effort in Great Britain.—A. I said twenty times, but it might be one hundred times. It is very largely in excess of any other effort.

The witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until Wednesday, March twenty-eighth, at 11 a.m.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. Would you have any of those pamphlets available for display?—A. I will be glad to supply them provided we have them here. There are pamphlets on the other side and if we have any in Montreal it would be because someone had been sent over. I can get them from London if you want to know.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. Suppose a farmer makes an application to your office for information and you supply him with that but he does not come back to you?—A. On the part of the farmer, I suppose a farmer applies to one of your officers for help and you are able to fill that application. Is any commission applied for on that?

A. No.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. I would like you to do a little more regarding the amount of effort that your Department puts forward in the United States. Is it based on sales on many occasions in Western Canada, that there was not much done there made to bring settlers from the British Isles. I would like to know how you just exactly how far you are concerned in this matter?—A. I would like to say very briefly in connection with the non-oriental countries, the Department meant maintain in each non-oriental country an official called a Canadian Liaison Officer. That is the only official maintained by our Department in that country. The colonies present themselves or are presented to that official. He examines them as to their qualifications for the class under which they desire to go to Canada and either sponsors or refuses them, so far as our Department is concerned. They are then prepared to be presented to the Government Liaison Officer for visa of their passport or for their examination. That is the extent of our organization in the so-called non-oriental countries.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. And what about Great Britain?—A. I have given you a general outline of what our organization is. It is a large organization and it costs a lot of money. We are exerting every possible effort to sell and sell the idea of going to Canada, to the classes of people in the United States that we are prepared to accept.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. You stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway is in six hundred thousand dollars last year?—A. The Department of Colonization and Development of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

By Mr. Brown:

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, March 28th, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The Committee proceeded with the consideration of the Immigration Act and Regulations, and the general subject of immigration.

J. N. K. MACALISTER recalled.

Mr. CAHAN: I would like to make a suggestion, not by way of precluding any questions on any particular branch of the Immigration subject, but rather that Mr. Macalister tell us frankly, from his point of view, the difficulties encountered in the present immigration system, and the suggestions that he has to make with respect to improvements.

Discussion followed.

The WITNESS: Might I take a few minutes to put in some statements that I have prepared, relating to previous evidence. I was asked at a previous session to submit information as to the number of colonists brought in by us from non-preferred countries, and the percentage of those placed in work other than farm labour. I would like to submit this information at this time. (Reads):

Approximate number of souls admitted to Canada for period December 1st, 1926, to November 30th, 1927, from non-preferred Continental countries under the Railways' Agreement, holding Occupational Certificates issued by the Canadian Pacific.	18,936
Number of men first placed during Spring 1927 in farm employment and released by farmers on account bad weather, and then placed by us temporarily in track work.	405
Men placed in track work temporarily, who we were unable to place in farm employment because of unseasonable weather.	238
	643

NOTE: These men were needed for work on extra gangs, such work being largely unexpected and due to the heavy rainfall necessitating early track work, and they did not displace local labour and were, of course, employed at the schedule rate of wages.

These men were later released from track work, and practically all placed in farm employment.

Then there is the translation of the statement on our occupational certificate, which is signed by the colonist from non-preferred countries on the Continent. The one I read a few days ago I found had first been translated from English to Polish, and then from Polish back to English, and in the process it had become a little mixed up. (Reads):

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Wording of Statement on Face of Occupational Certificate in Language of Colonist and Signed by Colonist

This Certificate is issued without charge and is valueless unless signed and stamped by an accredited Agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Undersigned hereby certifies that he (she) understands the conditions under which he (she) is accepted as a colonist to Canada; that he (she) is proceeding under the distinct understanding that he (she) is going as an agriculturalist, agricultural labourer or domestic servant and that he (she) must undertake to follow one of these occupations. In the case of farm labour or domestic service, he (she) will accept the current wages paid such help. The undersigned recognizes that refusal or failure to engage in one of the occupations mentioned will subject him (her) to return to the country of his (her) origin.

Then a question was asked, I believe by both Mr. Brown and the Hon. Mr. Tolmie, dealing with settlements effected by the Canada Colonization Association. I would like to read this memorandum:

Memorandum

Both Mr. Brown and the Honourable Mr. Tolmie in questions during the Proceedings, March 21st, in referring to settlements effected by the Canada Colonization Association referred to "communal system".

This may have conveyed the idea that each individual group carried on its operations jointly. This is not correct, as each family of each group usually operates its own farm. Whenever it can possibly be arranged, each family is issued a separate contract covering its own farm, although there is a joint and several liability agreement attached, making all other families in the group equally responsible.

I would like to say, in reference to Dr. Edwards' remarks this morning, that the figures which I will submit, covering Continental colonists brought to Canada by the Canadian Pacific, and colonists brought to Canada from the British Isles, will not in any sense indicate the effort made by our Department in these respective districts to get colonists. It seems to me ludicrous to compare the effort we are making in the British Isles with the effort made on the Continent. We have an immense organization in the British Isles, and we spend an immense amount of money there, in an effort to bring colonists to Canada, which is really ridiculous when compared with the results. No concern could do it on a business basis, it would be impossible.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. You are spending more money, and have a greater organization, in the British Isles than on the Continent?—A. Many, many times over.

Q. Why do you find it easier to get them on the Continent, with less activity and less expense on your part, than in Great Britain, where you have a better organization; what are the difficulties?—A. Well, the first and principal reason is that the people on the Continent are anxious to come to Canada. They want to come here and make their homes in Canada. Apparently there is not the same desire on the part of the people in the British Isles. That would be the first explanation. In the second place, there is an immensely greater percentage of the inhabitants of those countries on the Continent who are agriculturists, than in the British Isles. As we are only inviting, and endeavouring to obtain, agricultural colonists, it naturally follows that there is a greater number coming in from the Continent. The difficulty in bringing to Canada an equal number of so-called single men for farm labour—in referring to single men, we in colonization work, mean either single men, or a man

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

that is not accompanied by his family, because many of them are married but come without their families from the Continent—you cannot obtain an equal number of experienced British farm labourers, and it is difficult to place inexperienced Britishers in farm employment in Canada. Our organization has, particularly during the last fall and winter, made a strenuous effort to find places for inexperienced Britishers, and we have met with a very fair measure of success. We have been able, through our organization, to induce farmers to agree to accept and train inexperienced Britishers, with the result that we are in a position to receive far more inexperienced Britishers this year, than we have ever been before.

Q. Why is it easier to find locations for inexperienced Continentals?—

A. No, Dr. Edwards, we do not make an effort to find places for inexperienced Continentals.

Now, as to what can be done to speed up immigration from the British Isles. I have a pet theory of my own—it is not original; it has been tried out in a small way—that I believe would be a very great help. In placing it before this Committee, I am afraid that I will have to ask you to accept it as my own personal suggestion, and not as a suggestion from the Canadian Pacific Railway, because I have not discussed it with my superiors and have not authority for suggesting it as coming from the Company.

I am firmly convinced that Canada could receive, and absorb in agricultural employment, and eventual settlement, a very large number of British families, both experienced, and those who could not be called experienced agriculturists, but who have more or less knowledge of gardening and agriculture in a smaller way. I think, in order to do that, this country should embark upon a program of building ten thousand cottages, and have them scattered throughout the country. I am speaking particularly of the prairie provinces. According to the government statistics of 1926, there were approximately 250,000 farms in the three provinces. I believe ten thousand cottages could be located in well developed districts, properly selected, so that the head of the family, and the boys of workable age, could obtain farm employment, whether experienced or only partly experienced. The daughters of the family could obtain domestic service, and the family would be able to make a good living. My suggestion is that there should be three thousand cottages built this year, three thousand the following year, and so, until you get ten thousand of them. Then you could bring in the first three thousand families and place them in the first three thousand cottages.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Where would those cottages be located?—A. In the districts where there was farm employment available.

Q. In the farming districts?—A. Located on the farms. I would get two acres on the corner of a farm, either by lease or purchase, or at a nominal rental. I think the cottage could be built for a thousand dollars. There would be a lean-to barn or shed that would take care of a cow. The family would have a garden, and be able to raise a few pigs, and have some chickens. The mother, and the younger children would be able to take care of that garden and do what work there was to do around the home. The father and the older children could work. I believe that they would make a good living the first year, and a still better living the second year, because they would have greater experience. At the end of the second or third year that family is an experienced agricultural family, ready to be moved into a permanent agricultural settlement, and established as farmers in Canada. As the first three thousand move on to permanent settlement, you bring in another three thousand, and you will have a steady stream of British immigrants coming into this country. It would cost about three million dollars to build three thousand cottages, but I have no doubt that

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

the British Government would pay half. Therefore, it would cost this government a million and a half, and I think it would be the best investment they could possibly make, if they are earnest in their desire to bring British immigrants to this country.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Father McDonell had that scheme tried out, and it was not entirely successful.—A. I can tell you the reason I think it was not successful. I do not think the Scottish Emigrant Aid Society had the funds or men available to properly administer the plan. The cottages were badly scattered, and they had not the staff to go around and inspect them, and take care of those families.

Q. I know there was a great number of them empty?—A. That is true, but there should not have been any empty.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Would the cottage and the two acres of land remain in the right of Canada?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They would continue the ownership of it?—A. Yes, sir. I would not contend that the man would be supposed to work for the farmer upon whose farm the cottage was established. He would have the whole district as his source of employment. I think that scheme would have to be extended by evolving some scheme of assistance, say at the end of two years, to establish these farmers upon farms of their own. I believe that after a family of that kind has spent two or three years in Canada, at agricultural employment, the whole family being in agricultural employment, except the younger children and the mother of the home, that they could be established upon a farm at much less capital expenditure than a family that is picked up in the British Isles, brought over here and put on a farm. I do not think there is any doubt about it. The Three Thousand Family Scheme has demonstrated it, that you cannot find and bring any volume of agricultural families to Canada, and place them immediately upon farms. It would be courting disaster to take a family, that had never farmed, and bring them over here and put them down on a farm, unless they had a large amount of capital. We have got to bring these families in, whether they know anything about farming or not, and this country has got to turn to, and the farmers have got to help, to see that they are settled and make agriculturalists of them.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Would not this man be at the mercy of the man on whose farm he resided, as he would generally be a mile or so from any other work?—A. He would not necessarily live at home. During the period he is working for a farmer two miles away, he could live with the farmer.

Q. Would it not be as desirable to have these houses in the towns nearby, where the family would have the advantages of town life?—A. Well, Mr. Millar, in this whole scheme there is no doubt there will be considerable leakage. If you bring three thousand families in in one year, and put them in cottages, a percentage of those families are going to leak to the city. We may as well recognize at the start that they will not all go on farms. I think that if you established your cottages in the towns you are only inviting a greater leakage than you would otherwise have.

Q. There are a lot of people that work that way.—A. I think if they got a job in town they would take it, in preference to the farm job.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Has that been tried in Ontario, to any extent?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. About four years ago there were a few cases of cottage settlements in
Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Welland County, in the fruit district; I was wondering if you knew about that?—A. No, I do not.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: A scheme, such as outlined by Mr. Macalister, has received some consideration from the Ontario Government in settling one hundred acre farms up in New Ontario.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: We have a scheme under discussion, not quite along these lines, but along similar lines.

The WITNESS: I am trying to steal your thunder, Mr. Forke, I did not know of it. As I said, there is nothing original about this plan, and I am not presenting it as an original plan. As Mr. Stewart said, it has been tried out by Father McDonell. I might say, Mr. Stewart, that I happen to know, at the moment, that there is a very strong demand for those cottages this spring, and there is not any doubt that they will all be filled.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: It may have been a mistake to bring in the class of settlers that he was bringing, and settle them in a more or less French Canadian district; that may have been the reason why these cottages were not used. All I know is that they were not being made use of.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Is it not a fact that agricultural labour is scarce, at the present time, in the British Isles?—A. I believe so.

Q. I saw a speech by the Minister of Agriculture of Great Britain, who stated that there were more white people living off the farms in France than there were in the whole British Empire. It went on to say that experienced farm labourers were very few in Great Britain, and not sufficient to meet the actual demand there. Therefore, I would suggest that some scheme—I am not endorsing your scheme—such as Mr. Macalister suggests, is worth trying, if we are to bring in from Great Britain any large number of men who are eventually going on the farms. In going over Europe, I noticed that they have sort of communal settlements. A farmer may have a farm three or four miles away, but he likes to live in a village, where he can associate with others, and where his children go to school, and all the rest of it. He will take his team out and work a farm three or four miles away from his place of residence.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Is it not a fact, too, that the rate of wage for farm labour in Great Britain is quite comparable with the Canadian wage?—A. Yes.

Q. That is one of the serious difficulties?—A. I believe that the rate of wage is established by law. I think it is approximately \$30 a month for an eight hour day, and a half day on Saturday. We all know that we would not get very far on that basis in Canada.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Are you not up against this problem, in trying to get labourers for farm work from Great Britain? That is a country that, before the war, only produced thirty per cent of its own food. Does it not seem to be more or less impossible to go to a country, where there are so few farm labourers, and where they have to import sixty or seventy per cent of their food, and try to steal those people away to come to this country? Is not the whole thing prefaced on a wrong foundation?—A. Frankly, it has always seemed so to me. It has always seemed and impertinence on our part to go over there and try to take away their thoroughly experienced farm labour. Therefore, I say that the plan that I outlined, of taking the family that is not possibly a fully experienced agricultural family, but that wants to engage in an agricultural occupation—

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Q. Would it not be better to train them over there?—A. It would be better, theoretically, but, practically, I think we have got to bring them here, put them in cottages, and send them out to work, and supervise them and bring them up to the point where they are capable of taking over farms of their own.

By Mr. McPhee:

Q. I am informed, on pretty reliable authority, that only five per cent of the people in the British Isles are engaged in farming activities; have you any statistics on that?—A. I think that is possibly right. I believe seven per cent is the figure, but I have no definite statistics.

Discussion followed.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Would it not be better to let Mr. Macalister give us an idea of the difficulties of getting British immigrants? We know how easy it is to get Continentals, and Mr. Macalister may have other suggestions concerning British immigrants.

The WITNESS: I can only tell you that our organization exerts every possible effort to carry on an intensive campaign. We are spending an immense amount of money in advertising, in lectures, in pamphlets, and in moving picture shows to place before the people of the British Isles the advantages of coming to Canada for agricultural occupation. We have a very large staff, and we do, as I have said, everything we possibly can to induce them to come here. You will have the result when I produce the figures for Dr. Edwards.

I did not attempt to outline the family scheme in any detail, but I do not think we will get anywhere until we adopt something of that kind. A movement of that number of families to Canada will naturally bring with it a large movement of the single men. It is accumulative, and always will be, as is any colonization movement. You get the movement started and it grows and continues to grow until eventually it stops and flattens out.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Do you find, in your canvass for immigrants from the British Isles, that there is a disposition, on the part of the immigrants to want to be assured of assistance?—A. You mean in establishment upon the land?

Q. Yes, or a guaranteed assistance of some sort?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Is that invariably true? Do they want to be assured that they will not have to depend entirely upon themselves?—A. My experience is that the colonists—I will not specify any class—coming to Canada to-day expect much more assistance than they did in the old days; they expect to be taken care of and helped.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. It would be expected that they would have that attitude, in view of the fact that you are asking them to come?—A. Possibly.

Q. They are likely to say, "well, you make it worth our while".—A. Possibly.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Does he simply want work, or does he want some monetary assistance?—A. It is hard to specify, but there is that atmosphere. They want to be taken care of and helped along.

By Mr. Caham:

Q. Would your scheme of providing cottages also imply that advances would be made to assist in the purchase of one or two cows, and getting some farming implements?—A. Not at the start. I think the man should have a cow, and a few chickens and a couple of pigs, and this acre or so of garden should be broken up for him, so that he can put in a garden. He may have some garden tools.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Q. Would you provide that, or would he be expected to come with sufficient financial resources to enter into farming modestly?—A. I would provide him with what he would have to have, because, if we wait for the fellows that are able to provide for themselves, we will not get them.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. If you provided too much work on his own piece of land, would there not be difficulty in a farmer getting him to work for him?—A. I would not provide him with more work than his wife and younger children could do. His wife and children can milk a cow and gather a few eggs, and do a small bit of gardening.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. Does a man find any difficulty in getting work all the year round in the West?—A. That question cannot be answered yes, or no.

Q. Are the farmers in the West prepared to employ a man all the year round?—A. A great many of them are, yes.

Q. Would you say that that was general?—A. With diversified farms, or mixed farms, yes. On a purely wheat producing farm, where the work is carried on mostly with power tractors, and so on; no cattle or pigs, and no work during the winter except to haul grain, no.

Q. When requisitions are made for assistance, are they for work all the year round, or seasonal? When a farmer makes a request for assistance, is it, as a rule, for the harvest months, or does he undertake to engage the man all the year round?—A. The majority of the applications state for one year.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. In connection with your scheme, have you thought of the necessity, or perhaps the desirability, of entering into an arrangement with individual farmers who might enter into a contract to employ a man settled on the farm?—A. No.

Q. My own opinion is that a good deal can be said in favour of the scheme. I know that many farmers would be prepared to employ a man and his family all the year round, if they had a house to put them in—A. Exactly, that is the point.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. You have been talking about the British immigrant from the agricultural standpoint. Do you find the same difficulty in inducing mechanics, and the other classes of British immigrants, to come to Canada—A. You are getting out of my sphere entirely.

By Mr. Spence:

Q. You have been endeavouring to get experienced agriculturists from Great Britain?—A. We have been endeavouring to get the class of people from Great Britain who were willing to enter into an agricultural occupation in Canada.

Q. You would not have so much difficulty if you made up your mind to bring in inexperienced help? I do not mean mechanics, I mean inexperienced people that would engage in farm work?—A. We could get a large number, yes. (Discussion followed).

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. Have you any suggestions to make with regard to the present regulation?—A. This plan has only been in operation for slightly over thirty days, as I said yesterday, and I do not pretend to be familiar with all the details.

Q. How does it differ from the old plan?—A. Under the old plan they went to the roster doctor in their neighbourhood and were examined. You mentioned the life insurance man. When you put your signature on the dotted line, the life insurance agent does not let any grass grow under his feet before he gets you to the doctor.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I do not like to interject, but when you realize that a family leaving Great Britain is doing something that will affect their whole after life, do you think it is such a serious thing that they have to wait a week or two to think about it?

The WITNESS: I do not wish to suggest that it can be done the same as a life insurance examination can be done; that was only to illustrate the advantage of doing it as quickly as it could be arranged.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. If the immigrant has made up his mind to come here, why should he have any difficulties put in his path?—A. My whole theory is that when he has once made up his mind to come to Canada we should perfect machinery that will enable him to come as quickly as possible. There is always the danger that he will change his mind, and either stay at home or go some place else. I feel very earnestly on that subject. In the Colonization service we speak of the solicitor as the man out on the firing line. I have been out on the firing line and I know what I am talking about. Twenty-one years ago, when I first became connected with the Colonization Department of the Canadian Pacific, they started me out in the State of Iowa, driving from farm to farm, trying to induce the farmers to move to Canada. I want to tell you that it is hard work, and I commend to your sympathy the men in the Government Service, or any other service, who are trying to induce people to come to Canada, because they have not got any snap. I can recite case after case of families in Western Canada, who are to-day prosperous farmers and good Canadians, who had been called upon by colonization agents and induced to agree to come to Canada. They will tell you to-day that they would never have made their first trip of inspection, had it not been that the colonization agent drove to their farm the day they had agreed to go to Canada and induced them to get in to his automobile, and took them to the train for Canada. They had decided one day that they would go to Canada, but two or three days later they decided they would not go. The only reason they did go was because they were again persuaded, and when they said they would go that time, they were gotten into the automobile and on to the train, and taken to Canada.

Discussion followed.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Are there any delays or inconveniences, in connection with the medical examination of the immigrants from the British Isles, which might be removed or lessened?—A. At the present moment, Dr. Edwards, I think there are. From what I gather, from conversations I have had with Mr. Forke, and officials of the Department of Immigration and Colonization, the whole scheme is being revamped. They are trying to get this into workable shape, and I do not see any object to be gained by my standing up here and telling you that they did so and so a month ago, or they did so and so six months ago. Those things are passed and gone.

Q. You say that there are delays or inconveniences which, in your judgment might be removed or lessened. I would like to get your view as to what way you consider that those inconveniences or delays might be removed?—A. That is exactly the thing that I have been dwelling upon, to get this machinery oiled up and working to lessen the lapse of time. In asking that, I think you have covered the whole thing.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Assume that you have canvassed a man, you have him signed up to go to Canada; what difficulty do you encounter?—A. Suppose we have called on John Jones. We have got him to agree to say, "Yes, I will go to Canada."

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

He has signed the application presented to him by the Canadian Pacific, we will say, or the Canadian National, or any of these other societies. That application is sent to a Canadian Government Immigration Agent, and dealt with by him from that point on. He notifies the applicant where to appear for his medical examination, and when to appear, and where to appear for his civil examination, and when.

Q. What do you mean by civil examination?—A. To see whether or not he is of the proper class, whether he has had experience in agricultural work, we will say, to see whether he is of the proper class to come over to Canada. I am speaking now, by the way, of the assisted passage. There are some eighteen or twenty or twenty-five doctors in the British Isles that are covering, I think, Mr. Egan said the other day, three hundred and thirty-four points. I do not think that number of doctors can visit that number of points and inspect these applicants, so that each will receive an examination or inspection within a reasonable limit of time after he has made application.

Q. Your criticism, if it would be a criticism, or your suggestion is that there should be less delay in the medical examination?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Something in the way of having the medical examination assist them, rather than having the possibility of them coming to you and being rejected afterwards?—A. When these men get their photographs on a card, and it has been signed, they think they are going to get in to Canada all right.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. The whole idea of the medical inspection is to prevent them from getting over here and being returned on account of physical unfitness?—A. I believe so.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. When we had the evidence of the medical men, regarding these examinations, it proved conclusively that it was not an examination at all, it was only an inspection. Do you not think that the old system of doing that at least facilitated things much more than at present?—A. To have them examined in Canada?

Q. No, by the roster doctor over in Great Britain?—A. Oh, yes, I think that system was less objectionable on the part of the colonist, and I think they got quicker service.

Q. It facilitated the movement of the immigrant?—A. Mechanically, yes. I am not competent to speak from the medical standpoint.

Q. The medical standpoint was that it was practically an inspection, without an examination at all. One doctor is just as capable of doing that as another.

Mr. BROWN: There was a possibility of his being returned when he got here.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Have you any further suggestions to make?—A. Well I have an idea in my head that I can place before you. It is not in connection with British immigration, but with Continental.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You have discussed the question of agricultural colonists from the British Isles altogether. There is no restriction on any other sort of immigration from Great Britain?—A. Except the medical examination.

Q. No occupational restrictions?—A. I do not believe so.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Let us have your suggestion?—A. I do not presume that there is any likelihood of its ever being adopted, but, in my opinion, it should be. We are bringing out a lot of so-called single men to Canada from the continent. I believe I am safe in saying that seventy-five per cent of these men are married, and arrive in Canada without their families. Many of them have borrowed money in Europe to purchase their tickets to Canada, while others have used their entire liquid capital to arrive here, and are depending upon money earned in Canada to finance the arrival of their family a year or two years hence. I think that very fact is responsible for a considerable portion of these men leaving farm employment. They hear stories of men who are earning five, six, or eight dollars a day in industries, and they feel that they could earn and save far larger amounts in that employment. It brings before them the picture of their family arriving six months or a year earlier, than they otherwise would, and the temptation is too great for them. I think that some plan or scheme should be evolved whereby, after one of these men has been in Canada for a year, and has stayed in an agricultural occupation, and demonstrated his intention to become an agriculturist, that he is honest and is reasonably dependable, and has saved a certain amount of money, say twenty-five per cent of the cost of transporting his family from the Continent to Canada, that some plan must be evolved whereby he can get credit for the balance of the transportation cost of bringing his family here. This is another thing that is not original. This scheme is being worked out to-day by various organizations in Canada, in a small way. I have in mind one particular society that has followed along this line for five years. They have advanced probably \$150,000 to \$200,000, with an operating loss of \$180 up to the present moment. The money was repaid by the man in Canada after the arrival of his family. I do not think that these men will ever be contented, or permanently established in this country, until their families come out and they feel that they are reunited and have something to work for.

Q. Why do you think that that is not likely to be adopted?—A. Because I doubt if the Government would undertake it in view of the sentiment there appears to be, relative to Continental immigration. I would like to see it adopted, I think it should be adopted, and I hope it will be adopted.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Do you think that any of these organizations paying out money, as you say, to the extent of \$150,000, to bring immigrants out here, are making any profit out of this? That is, suppose they put up \$100 to bring a man here, is he obliged to pay them back \$200?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you not think that is being worked?—A. I know it is not, in the instance I referred to.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. What would be the cost of bringing a family of five, say a wife and four children, out from a Continental country?—A. It would depend on the age of the children, but I would say that the cost of the tickets, plus the cost of their incidental expenses, would be, roughly speaking, about \$750, for a family of five.

Q. And you would suggest that there should be some supervision of those who come out, for the first year, and then, if they turn out well, that the Government should advance sufficient to bring out their families, and enable them to settle?—A. I would not go to the expense of supervision. I would tell that man when he came into this country, "you go to this farm job. If you lose it, get another one. You stay at farm employment and then come around at the end of the year and show me what you have been doing for the past

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

twelve months." Put the obligation of proof upon him, and not have the burden rest with us.

Q. And you would work that in connection with your cottage scheme?—

A. I was thinking of the cottage scheme only in connection with British immigration.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. It might very well be used to supplement the other?—A. Oh, I think they would both work at the same time, if that is what you mean.

Then I would go still further. After that continental and his family were here, then I would provide a small amount of credit for his establishment upon the farm. We are doing that, not only in connection with continental colonists, but with any colonists. We have set aside large areas of our lands that we let the man farm. We loan it to him for four years. He makes application for a piece of land at a definite price to-day. There is no interest accumulates or accrues, and no principal payments due until four years have passed. The only thing he does is to pay the taxes on that land in the meantime, and agree to develop and improve it. In other words, we loan him the land for four years, and he has four years to make a farm out of it and bring it to a state of production before he begins to pay the Canadian Pacific anything. I think these continental families could be established with a credit of \$500.

By Mr. McPhee:

Q. You mentioned one case where families had been financed to the extent of \$200,000, with only a loss of \$180. Have you considered the fact that the transportation companies might do that financing rather than the Government?

Mr. CAHAN: Why should the transportation company do it?

Mr. MCPHEE: Because they get the money.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. What security was given?—A. Notes.

Q. No collateral security?—A. Endorsers.

Q. Do they get that endorsement from the man they are working for?—A. In many instances.

By Mr. McPhee:

Q. What is the cost of passage to Winnipeg from, first of all, the British Isles, and, secondly, from the continent, when a man pays his own way, and when he gets assisted passage?—A. The assisted passage rate you will find in your Department of Immigration literature, and it is in the report of the meeting also. I am not a traffic man, and I cannot quote the rate from the continent, except to say that for the majority of non-preferred countries it is about \$137 to port, plus \$25 railway fare to Winnipeg.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Just to clear up that last point. Were any of those endorsers ever called upon to pay?—A. I would say a few of them were.

Q. The number was small?—A. I have a recollection of discussing that point, and I think in some few cases it was collected from the endorser.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Have you any further suggestion to make?—A. Yes. I think our work would be greatly facilitated, and that the Department of Immigration would have fewer criticisms from the residents of Western Canada, and the members of Parliament would have fewer criticisms from their constituents, if the establishment of additional immigrational halls could be brought about in Western Canada. At the present time we have two of them in Winnipeg. I think it

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

would be a very great advantage, in handling the large number of colonists that are coming, and that we hope will come, if adequate immigration facilities could be provided at Saskatoon, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton and various centres of distribution.

Q. What is the nature of that accommodation?—A. There is a hall with beds and bedding. There are separate quarters provided for families, and men or families are permitted to go in and occupy these quarters during the night. They live there temporarily while they are passing through, or waiting distribution. The officials of the department will tell you much more about it than I can.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. It is the same idea as the sheds at the ports?—A. On the same order. It is to provide temporary accommodation. Where you are bringing in thousands of colonists, and particularly at one season of the year, as we have to in the Dominion—the biggest volume of our immigration comes in during the spring months—I think it is physically impossible to handle those men, bring them in, and distribute them to their destinations without commotion and without complaints from the towns and cities. Complaints are made of surplus people being brought in, simply because they see mobs hanging around. You cannot bring them in and get them all on the train for their destination the same day they arrive in Winnipeg, or any other centre.

By Mr. Spence:

Q. Even though you have places for them?—A. It is a physical impossibility.

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. Just a question regarding that ten thousand cottage proposition. I understood you to say that it would require an expenditure of three million dollars. Was that per year, or for the whole scheme?—A. I estimated that it would cost a thousand dollars each to build these cottages. If you are going to supply three thousand of them this year, it will cost you three million dollars. I suppose that the British Government would pay half of that.

Q. That would be \$1,000 expenditure for the cottage, and \$500 on the transportation?—A. Oh, no.

Q. For a family of five?—A. No. I am speaking of British settlers and the Canadian Government pays £3.10 on that transportation.

Q. I am referring to your suggestion to assist families to come out from the Continent, when the father has been out here a year?—A. I am not speaking of these cottages for Continentals at all.

Q. There was a suggestion that the two schemes might work together?—A. I said that they might be dealt with at the same time, but they do not interlock.

Q. I want to find out the total expenditure that would be required for the settling of one family in Canada. There would be \$1,000 for the housing scheme, about \$500 for the transportation, and another \$500 to establish that family at farm work. Two thousand dollars would be the total amount to be expended to get one family established. Is that the correct figure?—A. No, not at all. When you build a cottage you have got a capital expenditure that should be in existence, with reasonable care, for many years to come. It would be able to receive new families constantly.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. There would be no payment of \$500 to establish them on the farm?—A. That family is not costing you \$500 for transportation; they are coming out under the Empire Settlement Scheme.

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. I understood you to make the statement that when a man had earned about one quarter of the cost of transportation—A. Pardon me, you insist on mixing up these two schemes. One is British colonization, the other is the families of Continentals who have been in Canada and proven themselves desirable agricultural colonists. They do not interlock at all.

Q. You would spend \$500 for bringing out the family of a Continental, is that correct?—A. That has nothing to do with the cottages at all.

Q. Is that \$500 correct?—A. I think I said that a family of five from the continent would probably cost, for transportation and with incidental expenses, and so on, from the time of their departure to their arrival in Canada, approximately \$750.

Q. You stated that the person in Canada should have one quarter of that, the balance to be advanced, which would be approximately \$500, and you suggested an additional \$500 for establishing that family on the farm?—A. Yes.

Q. That is independent of the purchase of any land?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Have you any suggestion to make regarding the great handicap of seasonal occupation?—A. With the cottage scheme for British colonists, the family would have earned sufficient money to carry them through the winter. Their food is not costing them anything, outside of what little meat they eat; their cottage does not cost them anything, so where is the expense?

Q. A married man would have a hard enough time to keep his family during the summer months?—A. The man himself would be getting his food elsewhere; his adult children would be getting their food elsewhere, and the only people to feed during the summer time would be the mother and minor children.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. In your experience in the West, have you found any general feeling of indifference or opposition to bringing in a large number of farm settlers to the West? Have you met the feeling that you should leave the agricultural development in the West to develop along its natural lines, and not to stimulate the settlement of districts in the West?—A. Well, it would not be true to say that I have not heard that sentiment expressed, but it is not the predominant sentiment.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Not very much of it?—A. No, very little.

By Mr. Spence:

Q. Do you not think that the excessive passage rate charged by the steamship companies retards immigrants coming to this country? I am referring to the people who pay their own passage. The rates are exorbitant at the present time, compared to what they used to be.—A. I am not competent to say what the rates should be.

Q. If you are familiar with your work I would judge you would be able to answer that.—A. I can say that if I was on the Continent and was considering coming to Canada, I would probably be more likely to come if the rate was \$50 than I would if it was \$150.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. The same thing would apply to the British Isles?—A. Well, of course, they are getting a cheap rate now. There seems to be a very strong sentiment, particularly in Ottawa, against Continental immigration. You should bear in

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

mind that there is a desire, on the part of agriculturists on the Continent, to come to Canada at the present time. We have the opportunity to get desirable agriculturists from those countries, and there is nobody living that can tell you how long that movement will continue. Colonization movements usually start and acquire volume, and all at once they flatten out. You cannot tell whether that is going to happen next year or in five years.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. You are speaking now of Northern Europe?—A. Yes, I am speaking of the portions of Europe where we are bringing colonists from.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Are not a number of those from Northern Europe, or from the preferred countries, coming out here with the intention of working in mines, and that sort of thing?—A. They do not express that intention.

Q. But they do, as a matter of fact?—A. I do not know.

Q. We could get lots of that class of people from the British Isles, who are seeded in the mines here.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Have you any other suggestion to make?—A. When I first appeared before your Committee you asked me to outline the organization that our Department had for bringing colonists to Canada. I would like to touch, just for a moment, on the organization that we are maintaining in the United States, so that we can get a complete picture, if possible. We are maintaining offices at St. Paul, with sub-offices at Chicago, and Omaha; an office at Portland, Oregon and an office at Spokane, Washington. These offices are each in charge of an expert colonization official, with a travelling staff and office staff. Each office has under its jurisdiction a large number of agents who assist in interesting and bringing colonists to Canada. Our Toronto district office in Canada superintends our activities in the United States from the Eastern boundary of Ohio to the Atlantic. Our district office at Montreal superintends our activities in the New England States. We spend a very large amount of money in newspaper advertising. Our travelling staff carry on lecture campaigns, at seasons of the year when they are not engaged in trying to move individual colonists. We have large libraries of moving pictures that are shown by our own staff, and loaned to various organizations. In that way inquiries are obtained, and the names of people interested, or who it might be possible to interest in coming to Canada. Our travelling staff are supplied with automobiles, and they and our agents go out into the country and call on these people. They talk to them and endeavour to induce them to get on the train and go to Canada and make an inspection. When they are gathered together in parties of two or three, or more, one of our staff accompanies them, and goes to Canada with them and stays with them while they inspect the country. They endeavour to interest them, or convince them that they should either rent a farm, or buy a farm, or come to Canada and establish themselves as farmers. The movement from the United States is comparatively small at the present time, but it is gradually improving. Our organization for the past four years has shown a steady increase in colonists obtained from year to year, but I do not see any hope of a large movement from the United States for some years to come.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Have you any figures as to how many have been brought over from the United States?—A. I have not that with me.

Q. Can you give any comparative figures for last year, or for any other year?—A. I had not got it here, but I could get it. We used to bring them over

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

from the United States in special trainloads, and it dwindled down to nothing. It is gradually on the up-grade now, but it is coming very slowly.

Q. That is the period around 1911 you are referring to now?—A. 1911, 1912 and 1913.

Q. You say that the movement is satisfactory to your people?—A. Pardon me, you misunderstood me, the movement is not satisfactory to us.

I would just like to touch for a moment on the organization that we have on the Continent. At our sub-headquarters in London, England, Mr. Charles DeMey, our Continental Superintendent, has charge of the organization, both in preferred and non-preferred Continental countries. Mr. DeMey has been in this work for a great many years. He has been with our Department since 1912, I believe, and I think he is recognized and looked upon as being as familiar with colonization affairs on the Continent as any other man on the other side. We maintain offices of the Department of Colonization and Development of the Canadian Pacific in Rotterdam, Holland; Oslo, Norway; Gothenburg, Sweden; and in Copenhagen, Denmark. The Managers of each of these offices were born in the country in which they are now working, but they are all Canadian citizens. They have each had many years of experience in Canada, have become naturalized, and have gone back to the country of their origin as Managers of our offices. They know the conditions of the country in which they are working, and they also are intimately familiar with the conditions in Canada. They carry on such publicity as they are permitted to, under the laws of the country in which they are located, and do everything they possibly can, both themselves and their staff, to induce emigration to Canada.

I touched briefly, yesterday, on our organization in the non-preferred countries. We have our Certificate Issuing officers at Antwerp, Prague, Bucharest, Warsaw; and we are sending an assistant officer to Warsaw; and at Zagrab in Jugo-Slavia, and one at Riga. These men were also born in the countries in which they are now representing us. They have all had long residence in Canada, and they are all naturalized Canadians. They have intimate knowledge of the country in which they are working, and intimate knowledge of Canada. I think they have all had actual farming experience in Canada, except one. The colonists, coming from the non-preferred countries, are presented to these officers. It is their duty to talk to them and to determine whether they will make proper colonists for Canada, and whether they are of the class they represent themselves to be. As far as our Department is concerned, the decision of the respective Certificate Issuing Officer is absolutely final, if he says, "No, I will not approve that man," that man is not brought out under our auspices. If he says he will approve him, then he is presented to the Canadian Government official for either approval or objection.

Q. In the case of a resident of Canada, from one of these countries, who is desirous of bringing some friend of his, and who prepays the passage to the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is forwarded in the ordinary course, I presume, to your agent at Prague, or wherever you may have the agent; is that correct?—A. You are speaking of nominations?

Q. Nominations, yes?—A. Nominations made by residents of Canada for men from Cheko-Slovakia?

Q. We will say that a man wants a woman, as is the case I have in mind?—A. A resident of Canada makes a nomination of a family from Cheko-Slovakia to come to Canada.

Q. He buys the pre-paid tickets; what is the procedure then?—A. He, first of all, makes his nomination. That nomination, and the prepaid ticket, would be delivered to one of our steamship offices, at the time he purchased the ticket. The steamship office forwards the ticket to Prague, and forwards the nomination to our office in Montreal. Our Headquarters will then investigate the nomination,

[Mr. J. N. K. Macalister.]

and eventually either approve or refuse it. In the event of approval, it is sent by us to our officer in Prague, who informs the traffic official that there is an approved nomination for a certain individual. The procedure is then followed out, as I have described.

Q. Does the Immigration Department figure in this matter at all?—A. After our Certificate Issuing Officer says, "Yes, I will pass them," They are presented to the Canadian Government Immigration Inspector, and he has the final say as to whether they shall go, or whether they shall be turned back.

Q. Does he have a personal examination?—A. Does he meet the man personally?

Q. Yes.—A. Oh, yes.

Q. I have grave doubts about that.—A. I have not any doubt.

Q. I will give you a case in point.—A. He does not meet him in Prague, he meets him before he gets on the boat.

Q. This man was a stranger to me, but he is apparently all right. He had a couple of hundred acres, partially cleared, and was going well. He wanted a woman to come over to marry him, some girl that he knew in his native country. He sent a pre-paid passage by the C.P.R. and the answer came back that in order to have that done it would be necessary for him to have a Federal member make an application to the Immigration Department?—A. That was not necessary, he could have made it himself.

Q. What was the reason for doing that?—A. Because fiancées are not covered under the Railway's Continental Agreement. She was not coming out as a domestic servant under our Continental agreement.

Q. In other words, this woman would have been accepted as a domestic, but not as a wife, had that man nominated her as a domestic?—A. No, because if he had shown as a single man, and nominated this woman, the nomination would not have been approved.

Q. I looked into this case myself, and the outcome was that there was so much delay with the Department, that in the meantime she had married somebody else. However, he nominated another one, and the Immigration Department forwarded that one a little quicker.—A. I do not presume that I will be called upon again, and I would just like to say that during the time I have been before you I have made an earnest effort to give you an idea of the organization of the Department of Colonization and Development of the Canadian Pacific. It is quite natural for me to think and I do believe that we have the finest colonization organization that was ever gotten together. I do not think that in the history of the world there has been a colonization organization in existence equal to ours. I have given you an idea of what it is and I want to say earnestly that that organization is available to the Dominion of Canada for the carrying out of any practical colonization scheme, or plan, that this Committee, or this Government may evolve.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: There are two pieces of information I would like to get from the Minister, or his Deputy. We all know that Father McDonell brought a number of settlers out here, and established them, and apparently earned his money in bringing them out. First of all, I would like to know how many settlers were brought out by Father McDonell and successfully settled here, and at what cost to the Government. Secondly, I would like to know the cost to the Government in repatriating French Canadians from the United States and bringing them back to Canada.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, March 30, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock, a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The Committee proceeded with the consideration of the Immigration Act and Regulations, and the general subject of immigration.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have with us to-day Dr. Black, who was summoned to appear as a witness to give evidence this morning. Before calling on Dr. Black I want to say that unless the Committee can gather a little more punctually, I will adjourn this Committee at 11.15 if a quorum is not present. It is now 11.25 and we have not got a quorum. It is not fair to the members who are here to expect them to sit around and wait for the others to come in, after this I will adjourn the Committee at 11.15 if we do not get a quorum.

WILLIAM J. BLACK called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. What is your position with the Canadian National?—A. I am Director of Colonization, of Agriculture, and of Natural Resources.

Q. Will you make a statement of your organization to the Committee?—A. I shall be glad to. The Department of Colonization of the Canadian National Railways was organized in the year 1923. It has associated with it a Department of Agriculture and also a Department of Natural Resources. The activities is to some extent occasionally interlock. I wish, first of all, to give you an outline of the principles of policy which were drawn up to guide the Department first in the development of its organization, and afterwards in its activities. These were drawn up at the beginning in the year 1923, and they have been followed as closely as possible since that time.

1. To influence the immigration and satisfactory settlement in Canada of the largest possible number of people of productive capacity that the country can absorb and assimilate;

2. To promote the land settlement of new Canadians under conditions that will ensure the maximum possibility of success in their farming operations, and enable them to enjoy such social and religious institutions as are necessary to individual happiness and contentment.

3. To encourage improvement in agriculture so that more diversified methods may be used in farming, and that crop, live stock and dairy production may be increased in accordance with market demands and prospects.

4. To assist by organized effort in the immigration of young people of desirable type and character, especially from Great Britain, and in their placement in respectable rural homes where they may become qualified to participate in constructive activities and acquire citizenship of distinct value to Canada.

5. To aid in the development of new opportunities for service and to facilitate every effective means of selecting immigrants physically fit and anxious for work.

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

6. To co-operate with the Federal and Provincial governments and business organizations throughout the Dominion in promoting all measures calculated to contribute toward an increase in immigration of adaptable people and in their settlement under the most favourable conditions possible.

7. To contribute to the dissemination of information concerning the vast and extensive natural resources of the Dominion and the widespread opportunities for industrial development, so that capital may be attracted from other countries and invested where enterprise will be legitimately rewarded.

Following these principles as outlined, the following primary purposes were adopted for guidance in operating the Department.

1. To hasten the occupation and cultivation of vacant lands adjacent to Canadian National Railway lines.

2. To ensure that districts served by the Railway shall have advantage of the maximum number of new settlers arriving in Canada.

3. To make certain that farmers adjacent to our lines shall have adequate labour to the end that their production shall be increased.

In our organization there are three sections, the Canadian, United States, and Overseas, the headquarters being at Montreal. In Canada we have two divisions, Eastern and Western.

The Eastern Division is administered from Montreal. In addition to the local office there, which co-operates with the Provincial Government organizations of Ontario and Quebec, we have a sub-office at Moncton for the Maritime Provinces.

Our chief office for the Western provinces is at Winnipeg, with sub-offices at Saskatoon and Edmonton. At Vancouver we have an office, in association with the Industrial Department which is devoted more largely to natural resources. We give very little attention to the placement of people in Vancouver, for reasons which I will indicate later.

In the United States our organization is centred at St. Paul. It is not large as we only have a few on our staff. Over there our effort is necessarily a question of land selling. We are not duplicating anything that the Canadian Department of Immigration is doing. It is not a question of getting Americans to come to Canada to engage as farm workers because they are not available for that employment. We had an office at Boston, but it was closed a year or two ago because we were not able to do really effective work in that area. We also had an office at Seattle but it was closed, largely for the same reason. The American situation, in general, I shall deal with later.

In Canada, we are working in the closest possible co-operation with the Federal Department of Immigration and Colonization. We aim to co-operate for the reason that we recognize it would be undesirable to have any duplication. They assist us occasionally, wherever it is convenient for them to do so. In a general way we harmonize our efforts with those of the Department in the placement of new settlers throughout the country. I do not wish to infer that we are loading, or attempting to load on the Federal Department of Immigration any responsibilities for the activities that are initiated by ourselves, or are entirely under our control. That is not the case.

We also co-operate, as closely as possible, with the various provincial departments of immigration, where such exist. This applies to Ontario and to a considerable extent to Quebec. The Governments of the Maritime Provinces also co-operate with us and so do the Governments of the Western Provinces, in so far as they are taking an active and direct interest in this particular question.

In addition to these offices and the officers directly associated with them we have a number of field men who work for us when occasion requires, but who are not regularly on our pay list. We have not followed the practice of organizing associations, or clubs, or boards at local points throughout the

country to any extent. We try to interest what would usually be the Chairman of such a local organization, or the Secretary, or the most active individual. With organizations of that class in rural districts, it usually devolves upon some one individual to do most of the work. That has always been my experience, when living in the country, and I think that is the experience of most of you.

HON. MR. MOTHERWELL: You interest the President or Secretary of an already existing organization?

DR. BLACK: Not necessarily the President of an existing organization. We select some individual in that community who is willing to assist us; who is thoroughly familiar with the conditions and the needs of that district, and who can spare sufficient time to look after our interests, when we have occasion to call upon him.

That service is confined almost altogether to first determining the amount of help that will be required in a district adjacent to our railway line, and also to the development opportunities that there may be in that community for the settlement of families. When the workers arrive, these men meet the trains at Winnipeg, or at their own station, and received them and distribute them. They do the same thing with families.

We have some 418 such men upon our staff who are giving us service and who are paid for the particular service which they perform, and for nothing more.

Then we also have our regular station-agents. They are working in close association with us. There are 2,221 of these agents, and while all are not actively engaged, a large percentage of them are. They assist us, when required, by looking after people at any particular point. In the three prairie provinces, where the services of the station agents are of the most value, we have some seven hundred.

Then we are working in association with several religious organizations. There is a certain work which we find church organizations can do, that probably cannot be done so well by any other kind of organization. Invariably the church organization takes a special interest in looking after the people when they arrive, and, if need be, in the case of a family, they take them into their own homes and look after them in that way. Not only that, but they see that they get settled in districts where they will be within reach of a church of their own faith, which is a very important matter with most of the new people coming to this country. We have been able to assist them considerably in facilitating their activities, and some of the very finest settlement work that is being done to-day in Canada is being done under these auspices.

Passing to our overseas organization. Just on this point, I wish to point out that the most important question, with regard to the actual settlement of people in Canada, is right here in Canada and not overseas. Apart, possibly, from the difficulties that we encounter in interesting enough of the right kind of people in the British Isles to come to Canada the effort on the other side of the Atlantic is small in comparison with the effort that it is necessary to make in this country, in order to settle people into homes of their own, under the conditions that necessarily exist here at the present time.

The headquarters of our organization covering the Continent and the British Isles is at London. At the same point we have a local office, and others at Liverpool, Glasgow and Belfast. For the Continent, we have a superintendent whose office is at London and who operates under the European Manager. There are district offices in Norway, at Oslo; in Sweden, at Gothenburg; in Denmark, at Copenhagen and also at Rotterdam in Holland. These are the only offices that the Colonization Department of the Canadian National Railways have on the Continent of Europe.

We have Certificate Issuing Officers, in connection with what is known as the Railways Agreement—which, I understand, has already been explained to

you, and with which you are already familiar. We have two such officers at Warsaw, one of whom spends part of his time in the Baltic States. Another is at Prague in Czecho-Slovakia, and a fourth at Zagreb in Jugo-Slavia. Then, we have three other officers on the Continent who give part of their time to this class of work; one at Paris, another at Antwerp, and a third at Rotterdam.

On the Continent our regular offices act as information bureaus. We distribute literature from these points, but, with the exception of Holland, there are no lectures being given. Holland has been less rigid, insofar as refusal to allow Canadian officers to conduct propaganda is concerned, than any other Continental preferred country.

In the Scandinavian countries, until the last couple of years, it has been practically impossible to attempt any kind of propaganda. When we started in Denmark the Danish authorities made it very clear that they did not wish us to do any advertising, give lectures, or otherwise to attempt to induce the Danish people to go to Canada. They did, however, make it clear to us that they would be very glad for us to give information to all who were interested in Canada and who desired to come to this country. We started in there very quietly, and, I am glad to be able to say, we gained the confidence of the Danish people. We have followed the same course in Norway, and again in Sweden, with equally satisfactory results.

Our offices were opened in Norway and in Denmark in 1924, and in Holland during the same year. Our office in Sweden two years later.

Before referring further to the question of lectures, I wish to speak of a special branch of our service in Canada. I have said that the great problem is in looking after the people when they arrive in this country. We have organized, and have had in existence for two or three years, what is known as the Canadian National Land Settlement Association. I believe Mr. Macalister mentioned in his statement that we were associated with the Canadian Department of Immigration and the Canadian Pacific in the management of the Canada Colonization Association.

About 1923, or 1924, it became apparent that most of the settlement work that the Canada Colonization Association was doing was the settlement of Mennonite people. As we were not, at that time, engaged at all in the movement of Mennonite people, there was not a great deal to be gained by the Canadian National Railways continuing with the Canada Colonization Association, and so we struck out on a line of our own, and we organized and incorporated what is known as the Canadian National Land Settlement Association, to which I have referred. This Association is controlled entirely by the Canadian National Railways, as a division, or subsidiary, to the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

The object of this Association is: 1, to increase settlement in Canadian National Railway territory; 2, to advise, assist and place new settlers to their own best advantage; 3, to supervise activities of new settlers in purchase of stock, equipment, etc., preparation of land, crops sown, and general work; 4, constant activity, finding, listing and handling desirable farms for newcomers. There is no commission whatever retained in connection with the activities of this organization. It exists for the purpose of fitting families on to farms under such conditions as farms may be obtained, and settlement thereon arranged. We have found that when a family, suitable for Canadian life, with farm experience, showing evidence of thrift, arrives in this country, that if they have a little money, the amount depending largely upon the country from which they come, there are available a great many farms where they can be started with little capital. We have located and established a great many families in this way.

In 1927 the Canadian National Land Settlement Association placed 1,228 families, either directly or indirectly upon the land. Of that number we placed

eight families in the Maritime Provinces; eleven in Quebec; ninety-five in Ontario; 106 in Manitoba; 427 in Saskatchewan and 581 in Alberta. You will probably be interested in the origin of these families. There were 306 families who were British or Americans; the majority being from the United States; 187 were from Scandinavian countries; 303 were of the German race, or German nationality, and 372 were from Continental non-preferred countries.

As a result of this activity, many abandoned or neglected farms have been successfully settled. However much we may desire to increase British settlement, we find that certain Continental people—as I think those of you who are actively engaged in that life in Western Canada know—make a success on farms which have been abandoned by others, or upon which others find difficulty in succeeding. We have formed some new settlements, and some old ones have been rejuvenated.

We know of 119,600 acres of new land that has been broken in Saskatchewan, adjacent to the Canadian National Railways line; and in Alberta 419,500, or a total of 530,100 acres in those two provinces. About fifty per cent of that area was scrub, or more or less treed.

Mr. CAHAN: Was that broken by new settlers?

Dr. BLACK: Not entirely by settlers who came out in 1927, but largely by settlers who have come to Canada within the last two or three years. Of course, the farmers who are already established there, in many instances, had a good deal of breaking done, but, to a large extent, this breaking was done by people who had come to Canada within the last two or three years.

In connection with this settlement activity it may be of interest to you to know that we have an arrangement whereby when we locate a family in a non-preferred country, or even in the preferred countries on the Continent of Europe, whom we consider are suitable people and would make successful settlers in Canada, we induce them to buy a Canadian National Money Order for the minimum amount which will be necessary, in our opinion, for them to have in order to start farming. They buy that Money Order payable to us at Winnipeg, and we direct the expending of it in the interests of the settler. It may appeal to some of you as being a rather extraordinary way of handling business of this kind, but, under the Railways Agreement, we have no desire to be parties to the introduction to Canada, or to be responsible to the Immigration Department of Canada, for the bringing in of families that will not become settled on the land. Notwithstanding the assurance which they always give in Europe that they have absolutely no other intention than that of settling on the land in Canada when they get here they occasionally indicate a desire to enter the cities. We overcome that by insisting on this Money Order before they leave the district in which they live, and it has a very considerable influence in ensuring that the individuals do not change their minds when they reach this country. As far as I am aware, and I think I know the facts, we have not had a single complaint from any settler whose money we have handled, that we have been unfair, or have not treated him honestly.

Mr. TOTZKE: To what extent has that been carried on?

Dr. BLACK: It has been done in nearly all cases of families coming from non-preferred countries. As I said before, we handled 372 families from non-preferred countries. We have been endeavouring to do it in the other countries as well. We got it going a little over a year ago, and I think that we will have it working practically everywhere this year. In some preferred countries where there is competition in securing desirable families other organizations than ours may take them without a deposit and as we are anxious to hold our own business we might not always insist upon it there. However, in the non-preferred countries, we insist on the money being put up.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Your real object is to know that you are going to sell them your own land?

Dr. BLACK: We have no land to sell these people, as a rule. We have not sold Canadian National Railways land to three per cent of these people.

Mr. CAMPBELL: You have no interest whatever in land?

Dr. BLACK: Except the interest of a railway serving that particular land, and our desire to see that land producing in order that we may have traffic from it. That is the fundamental reason. It is of no advantage whatever to the Canadian National Railways to settle any man adjacent to our line, unless he is settled under conditions which, in our opinion, give him a reasonable chance of succeeding. Otherwise he will be of no good to the railway whatever, and he only encumbers the ground. In other words the settler's own interest is identical with the railway's in that respect.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How much do you ask the settler to put up?

Dr. BLACK: That varies, to a certain extent, according to the country. Some of these people can settle with less than others. We have settled some Continental families with as low as \$300. We like to get \$500 but where we can get a farm with probably twenty or twenty-five acres under cultivation with a house that is habitable and we know that the individual can find employment in the neighbourhood, also if the settler has a family who can, to a large extent, take care of whatever farming operations there are, he can get through with \$300. Almost invariably we find that they have far more than that, but we insist on that as a minimum. Most of them have twice as much as we ask for, but we are able to start some families with \$300. We have a lot of German families that we have settled in that way and they are successful beyond a doubt. I can direct you to the settlement if you wish so that you can examine them at any time. I will name some of the settlements in a moment.

Mr. CAHAN: Before you are through will you tell the Committee what steps you take in the way of procuring actual settlement, as to where they settle, whether they have contracts for buying land, what arrangements are made that they may become permanently located in these places where you do locate them?

Dr. BLACK: I will explain that now. One of the activities of our Land Settlement Association is in finding places, that is farms that are available on easy terms. There have been a great many available in the last six or seven years. We ascertain that the farm can be obtained without any cash payment, and arrange that the individual may be given from twelve to fifteen years to pay for it. We satisfy ourselves as to the price, whether it is reasonable and fair. Indeed we do not allow a settler to go on a farm, under our auspices, unless we are sure it is a fair and reasonable price.

Mr. CAHAN: Are there a considerable number of such farms?

Dr. BLACK: There have been a great number, but they are becoming fewer. You have to have some kind of a house that is habitable. If it is in wooded country, the settler can very soon get protection for a cow and horse, and other shelter as necessary. Our whole effort in this connection, is to get the settler started with as little financial overhead as possible. Our experience has been that the less the settler has hanging over his head from the start, the better it is for him. Theoretically, we can argue that if a man has a good farm, that is, a piece of land that is going to be productive, with a healthy family able and willing to work, he will succeed. You can figure that out on paper and show an

exceedingly fine return. But in actual practice, considering the human limitations, if we are going to succeed as a railway organization in an enterprise of this kind, we find we must aim to keep down the overhead to the minimum.

An Hon. MEMBER: What is the average size of the farm?

Dr. BLACK: For those families who have limited means, they are usually 160 acre farms. That does not mean that 160 acres could be broken, but with sufficient arable land to provide a living from the start. If they have reasonably good luck, they may do better than that, as the family grows up.

Mr. LUCAS: What would be the average price per acre?

Dr. BLACK: I would like to give you that accurately. As a matter of fact, I did not think of bringing that before the Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It would not be more than \$15 or \$20 per acre?

Dr. BLACK: Where the family has limited means, sometimes it is even lower than that. In most cases it would be below \$12. Where they have more money than the minimum indicated they would be able, of course, to pay more.

Mr. LUCAS: How far would it be from the railroad?

Dr. BLACK: That varies.

I will read you this list of settlers, giving a sample of the groups we have settled. There are, in Saskatchewan, Eston, Richlea and Eatonia districts. The settlers there are not the class of families about which I have been speaking. They are mostly Americans, and they have money. At St. Walburg, Sask., we have settled a number of families of the class of which I have been speaking. They are located some distance out from St. Walburg and generally in a direction in which the railway is expected to go. Also, at Kuroki we have settled families, at Cold Lake and St. Paul in Alberta; at Pass Lake in Western Ontario, east of Port Arthur. The latter is a Danish settlement and the people there have gone on homesteads and are doing well. Then, at New Denmark in New Brunswick, there is a prosperous new settlement, also of Danes. At Ochre River and at Minitonas we have placed some families of the kind I have described. These have been placed on farms which had formerly been abandoned, and the settlers are doing well.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. They are mostly Germans?—A. Yes.

Q. Who abandoned the farms?—A. Very largely Canadians.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. But were they not abandoned in a very bad period—during 1921 and 1922?—A. There is something in that.

Q. The same people might do better now?—A. Yes, they might come back and succeed.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. Would you mind telling the Committee what arrangements you make to secure payments upon this land? Do you act as the intermediary?—A. No, we do not.

Q. As soon as you have found the settler, you turn him over to the owner and let him make what contract he can?—A. No, we never leave him. We walk by his side until the transaction is settled to our satisfaction—always. Not only that, but we provide some supervision in regard to his farming activities

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

for a year or two until we are sure he is getting along well. We make it very clear to him that at any time he may have any difficulties in the matter of payments or anything of that kind, we are prepared to act as his intercessor, because, we do not wish him to be disturbed if he is progressing at all.

Q. What is the nature of that supervision?—A. Our men call from time to time, depending upon the evidence of necessity for calling upon them.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Do you sell mostly by crop payments or cash payments?—A. We ourselves do not actually sell. We act as the intermediary. The system of payment depends upon the conditions. Let me here emphasize that our function is to negotiate as between the owner and the settler in order that the latter may secure the best conditions of payment possible. We have such a vast country and such a variety of conditions that what we can do successfully in one district may not be best for another district at all, and so the nature of the activities of any Canadian-wide organization must vary in different districts to a very large extent.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Just a question in regard to these American families who had money, which you said you brought in. Are you settling them on vacant land or abandoned land?—A. No. There is a case—and I am sorry I did not think of it when the other question was mentioned—where we have sold some Canadian National Railways land. I think practically all of the land that the Canadian National has had a monetary interest in selling in 1927 was sold to Americans, and those of you who are familiar with the American settler coming into Canada know very well that he always has his eyes open and can usually take care of himself. It is not a common thing for any American settler to pay more for the land than is being paid in the district for similar land.

Q. Are the majority of them settled on improved farms?—A. No, mostly vacant land. To a large extent these settlers are men who have been renters in the United States. Some of them had small farms and have sons who are requiring land. They sell out over there and are able for what they get, say in Minnesota or Iowa, for the land which they owned, to buy four times as great an area in Western Canada, and have their sons settle adjacent to them. That has been happening for many years, and is still happening to some extent.

Q. In regard to these families that you bring out from Europe under your supervision: can you tell the Committee the average cost to you of bringing these families out, settling them and supervising them for a year?—A. I cannot give you that, because we have never actually estimated that. It would be rather a difficult thing to do. It is not unduly great, however, for this reason: on the Continent of Europe there is not very much difficulty in getting a large number of people to come to Canada.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. They do not generally have much money?—A. They do not generally have much money, but still we are getting more and more people with a fair amount. We had one group of 193 families last year come to us, not all from the same territory, but under the same auspices, who landed in Winnipeg with an average of \$745 per family.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Were they Britishers?—A. No, not one of them. Quite a large percentage of them were Germans.

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. You get a good many Germans from these Slovakian districts, for instance, East Galicia, and so forth?—A. What has happened in this connection is this: there are many German families, or families of German race, who formerly lived under the flag of Germany or the flag of Hungary, but who now find themselves under the flag of Roumania or under the flag of Poland, and as they feel they are being oppressed politically and otherwise, and seeing no hope for the future, they desire to migrate. Their families in some cases experienced oppression generations ago and they fear a repetition of what has happened. They endeavor therefore to sell out, and they do sell out when they can get a reasonable price for their lands, and locate in another country. One of the chief difficulties they encounter in getting away is securing a reasonable price for their property. We are consequently getting many families that are exceedingly fine settlers. We have settled some in Western Canada which had as high as \$20,000. We handled \$230,000 last year in the way I have described; that is, \$230,000 were laid down on our counter in Canadian National money orders, and these settlers brought to us a capital altogether of over \$1,000,000 of which we know.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. I was very much interested in your description of the types you bring out. You mentioned, with some approval, the thrifty family. Would it be fair to say that your description of a thrifty family from Europe would be one who was willing to accept a lower standard of living than the average Western Canadian farmer?—A. When you are dealing with the standard of living you are dealing with a matter that is comparative. I am only expressing an opinion, although I realize that I am under oath. What you call a standard of living in this country would, I fancy, have been considered extreme extravagance by our grandfathers. I am not suggesting for a moment that the farmers of Canada to-day have a standard of living that is too high. I am not sure at all that they have. There are some who have, undoubtedly.

Q. But the thrifty farmer of which you spoke is of the type which is willing to accept a lower standard of living than the average Western Canadian farmer?—A. I am not quite sure what you mean by "a lower standard of living."

Q. I mean the average which the Western Canadian farmer possesses anywhere?—A. I am not sure whether I know that.

Q. You know the Western Canadian standard of living at the present time? You know the state in which the average Canadian farmer lives in Saskatchewan and Alberta? Knowing that, surely you can compare it with the standard of the immigrants?—A. It is a very comparative matter. If you mean that a man is going—

Q. To own an automobile?—A. I think it is all right for a man to have a motor car on the farm. In fact, I do not know of any class of men who has a better right to a motor car than a farmer, because he is living out from the centre of population, but I do not think that very many of the farmers who to-day have motor cars throughout the country—and as I say have a right to them—would have started the first year with a motor car. If they had, they would not be on their farms to-day.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. In other words, their standards have risen with their ability to pay?—A. I consider the standard of living of the people we bring out is just as high as was that of the homesteader of twenty years ago in Western Canada. In addition, we must not forget this, that the individual from the Continent to-day—the heads of the families and the members of the families—are just as ready to work as our fathers and grandfathers were, when they came to this country and settled, and after all that is one of the main reasons why they are so successful, just as

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

our forefathers were so successful under the same conditions. The trouble is that too many people come here and expect to start in where the others have left off and make a success, and no man with a little capital, or with borrowed capital, or with money handed to him will succeed if he is not willing to work.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Does the Canadian National Railways expect the farmers to put up with the standard of living from the Canadian National point of view? I think that would be very interesting.—A. I am sure they would. I want to say in answer to that question that we are not expecting any new settler who is settling under our auspices to live and work under any condition different from that under which I myself lived and worked as boy.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. Did not the Canadian National Railways have its shack days too?—A. I think so.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Are they willing to work under this policy of thrift? That is, do you expect them to settle and put up with whatever they can find in the way of housing, or equipment, or do they think they should have all the latest equipment to work with, or are they willing to go on and not assume a large overhead?—A. You are getting outside of colonization and are asking a question which should be answered by our president, and not by me. I am not speaking for the whole railway, but only for my Department.

By Mr. Howe:

Q. Is it not a fact that the standard of living of a settler is on a basis that absolutely discourages farm settlers from the British Isles?—A. No.

Q. Is it not a fact that about 10 per cent of those taking up land settlement schemes in Canada are Britishers?—A. I will come to that a little later on. There are a good many British being settled on their own account, but a deterring factor in preventing the British coming here to settle is the fact not so much that there may be a difference in the standard of living in Canada as the attitude of these people generally. No one regrets this more than I do, but the reason why the Continental European going on the land is easier to settle than my own flesh and blood coming to this country is because the Continental is a little more ready to work. Of course, there are exceptions to that. There are British people coming to this country who are as fine as any who ever came, but the rank and file are not as ready to work and put their backs into the kind of work in which pioneers have to engage, as are the people from the Continent. There is a decided difference there. There is no question about it.

Q. Is it not a matter of selection? The earlier pioneers, of which we were speaking a few moments ago, were principally British, and no class worked any harder than the British pioneer. Is it not merely a matter of selection? Do you mean to say that the British type is not as ready to work, if you find the right working class among them, as any other class?—A. I am sorry that my notes, which contain something of interest on this question, have been carried from the desk in mistake. I shall deal with that later.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. Do you think it is true that the average English tenant farmer, apart altogether from the actual land owner, the average English agricultural labourer with his minimum hours law and reasonable social standard, is disinclined to undertake the hardships of pioneering in Western Canada as we

know them?—A. The questioner has asked me whether it is a fact that the English tenant farmer, for example, is not, as I understand it, so favourably situated that he is not particularly interested in coming to Canada. That is largely true—very largely true. I wish to say at this point that the question of getting Britishers is not an easy one at all. Less than 5 per cent of the population of the British Isles to-day are engaged in agriculture, and Great Britain requires these people to remain there. There is no question about that. Although Great Britain is politically willing to let us take them if we can get them, the farmers' organizations over there are not, especially when it comes to endeavouring to induce their farm labourers to come out. They are opposed to their farm labour being canvassed. Then, again, there is going on in the British Isles a movement which is going on in every other country which is a joint agricultural and industrial country, and that is a movement from the country to the city. I lived in England for the calendar year 1924 and was in close contact with what was happening. I found that in the year previous—1923—the Ministry of Agriculture report showed that 60,000 people left the farms of England, Ireland, and Scotland, and went into the towns and villages. Now, we have that comparatively small population of farmers to draw from, and the wages are very nearly as good on an average as they are in Canada. They are paying as high as 32s. a week for experienced workers in such counties as Norfolk; they have their eight hour day and they have a half day on Saturday. Not only that, but they have ahead of them their old age pensions, which we have not got here. One of the questions which we are asked when we are endeavouring to get these people to come out is, "What can you assure us for the future?" Then, in addition to that there is a certain atmosphere since the war. Some day it is the dole—more properly called unemployment insurance—which leads people to think that it does not make much difference whether they work or not, as they will be looked after anyway, and there is not the same sense of pride in being independent that there was in the older days. In other words, it is a fact that the British race in the British Isles does not display the same genius for pioneering that they did in the days of old.

Q. Then the Committee may take it that your opinion is that if there is to be any rapid settlement in Western Canada, the bulk of it will have to come from other countries than England or the British Isles?—A. That is tying me down definitely to a direct assertion on an important question. I appreciate—

Q. It follows on your own statement.—A. If there is to be rapid settlement of Western Canada, a large percentage of it—I do not know just what the percentage would be, but it would be considerable—must come from the continent of Europe. I myself would like to see 75 per cent of it come from the British Isles, but if there is to be a rapid settlement of Western Canada, that is impossible. I am sorry to say that that is true, but it is. We must face the facts.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. Is it possible to have a rapid settlement of Western Canada?—A. It is hard to say what you mean by so-called "rapid settlement." That is a comparative matter as well. We had 159,000 people come into Canada last year, and most of them were supposed to go on to farms. If we were getting 400,000 or more, as we were in 1911 and 1912, that would afford an answer to your question as to rapid settlement.

Q. My point there is this: In those days we were opening up the country; we had good homesteads available close to the railways; there were jobs on the railways and work in all the little towns. That gave us a power to absorb immigrants which we have not got to-day at all.—A. You are quite right, and before I have finished I hope to have the opportunity of giving you the benefit of my observations as to some things in general which might be done.

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. You said if rapid settlement were to take place you would require to get your settlers from various sources. What do you call "rapid"? In the last ten years the wheat production has doubled from 200,000,000 to over 400,000,000. Is that "rapid"?—A. I should say so, but that does not necessarily mean rapid settlement. That is due to a large extent to the farmers increasing quite considerably the cultivation of the land under their control, and to the use of machinery as well.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. On that point I think you perhaps will have an idea. Do you think it wise to double our wheat production in the next ten years?—A. Well, of course, do you not think you are getting as good a price now as you did before it was doubled?

Q. I am asking for information, and I think the Committee have the right to expect that you would have an opinion, as you are engaged in the work in the west.—A. Some of the scientific people are greatly concerned with the fear that in the next hundred years the population of the world will be so great that we will not be able to raise food to feed them. Personally, I do not think there is any danger of that.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. Is there not a danger from over-production?—A. I think we ought to be more concerned with what will happen in Russia.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. would it not be wiser to increase our consumption rather than our production?

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Just a question arising out of your answer to Mr. Garland's question about the difficulty in getting people from the British Isles. Would you say that if our desire is to secure a very rapid settlement of the vacant land in Canada, we could secure it much easier if we devoted the energy we are now putting into Great Britain to Continental Europe?—A. An answer to that calls for some explanation. If we wish to take people from the Continent in larger numbers than we are taking them now, we do not need to put forth any special effort to do it. It is a question more of letting down the bars than of making a special effort.

Mr. EGAN: You have your railway agreements now, and—

The WITNESS: I said "letting down the bars." Perhaps that calls for some explanation as well. We have the railway agreement and we are able to bring forward all the families we can be sure we can handle properly at the present time, but I believe if it were not for the fact that we have a restricted area over there, or at least that there are certain countries which we class "non-preferred countries"—we would be getting people from them much faster than we are at the present time. That is what I had reference to.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Would the National Railways like to have that done?—A. The National Railways is a British institution.

Q. I think it is a Canadian institution, if I may differ with you. I am asking for information, and I hope you will be good enough to answer my question. Would you prefer that we allow them to bring these immigrants from non-preferred countries as freely as from Great Britain?

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

Mr. CAHAN: I object to that question. I think it is an unfair question, and to persist in that will provoke a very unpleasant discussion.

The WITNESS: I should like to answer that question. I should like to say that as far as the regulations laid down by the Department of Immigration are concerned, the Canadian National Railways is able to bring all of the people from these non-preferred countries that we want to bring at the present time. We are able to work within the regulations laid down and we are not bringing a single person from continental countries unless we are perfectly sure he can be placed on arrival.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. You are not asking that the bars be let down?—A. No, I do not wish to leave that impression at all. We are perfectly satisfied with the present arrangement in that regard.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Do you find that the average person coming from the cities and towns in England, not of the agricultural type, makes a good farm labourer when he comes to this country?—A. I will answer your question in a moment, in connection with our activities in the British Isles. In our organization overseas, the Canadian National Railways has a Canadian organization. The men on the other side who are running our affairs are Canadians. Two or three of them were born on the other side, but they spent most of their lifetime here. Our present Manager at London, Mr. Johnston, was at Winnipeg many years. I believe that most of you know him. He was born at Headingley, Manitoba. He had six or seven years' education in the Old Country, has been in Canada ever since, and identified with agriculture. He is a graduate of an agriculture college. The members of our staff are nearly all of that type. They are all Canadians, excepting a few of the clerical staff, which must necessarily be employed in England. Not only that, but our men are kept closely in touch with conditions in Canada. When a man has been over there for a length of time, there is a change made in the organization so that he can come back here, and some man from here takes his place. Our men on the other side are all thoroughly conversant with the actual conditions that exist in this country.

I have found this, as a result of experience many years ago in Western Canada that when the average Britisher comes to Canada he will have difficulties in fitting himself into conditions here during the first two or three months. Usually when he gets through the first two or three months he is able to manage very well after that. It is the first period that is the trying time. I came to the conclusion some time ago that if the attitude of the men, and the slant he takes towards his new life, and new job, could be changed to some extent, it would be a good thing. We devised a correspondence course in agriculture for prospective British immigrants. That may appeal to practical farmers present as being a ridiculous idea and I claim to be a farmer as practical as anyone else. We decided that by putting on a course of ten lectures dealing with an important subject of this kind and placing it in the hands of the individuals coming to this country it would get him thinking about the business of farming which they would need to understand and that in consequence his attitude towards his job would be different when he arrived here. We decided that we would charge ten shillings for the course so that there would be some value put on it, and when the lectures arrived they would not be thrown in the grate. We further decided that when the individual bought a ticket for Canada, we would apply the ten shillings on his ticket.

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

Here is a sample of the bound volume of the 10 lectures. We had to bind these in one volume for distribution in Canada, owing to the insistence of requests for them. This is regularly sold at \$1, but if there are any members of this House who would desire a copy, I shall be very glad to forward one to them, in order that they may see just what it contains. We do that for educational purposes only. The subjects are quite practical in character. The first is: Selecting a Farm and Erecting Farm Buildings; the next, Care of Live stock; Handling Farm Machinery; Dairying; Poultry; Grain Growing and Soil Management; Forage Crops; Fruit Growing in Canada; Home and Farm Management.

These lectures were written by an immigrant who was brought up on a farm in Ireland. He came to this country some years ago and worked on a farm in Manitoba in the summer time, and taught school in the winter. He went through Manitoba Agricultural College and was a Gold Medalist of that institution. The lectures were prepared from the standpoint of the beginner, because this man knew how the immigrant thinks, and he also knew the real problems facing a man when he arrives in this country.

That course has been running now for about four years. During last year, or from August 1st, 1926, to July 31st, 1927, we had 1,521 enrolled as students in the British Isles. There were also a few on the Continent, who could read English. We have had over 4,000 students study the lectures in the last four years.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Do you not have schools in the Old Country where you teach these students, as well as correspondence courses?—A. There are schools, but they are not ours; they are under the supervision of the British authorities. We have been providing this correspondence course and many who took it have come to Canada. I cannot give you the exact figures, but a great many of them have come to engage in farming and we had no trouble with them. Not that they know perhaps any better how to harness a horse or milk a cow but they have become mentally related to their new job, so that he is not hard for the farmer to train. We have had many farmers who have employed these men tell us that they would rather have a man who had never worked on a farm, a reasonably good type of fellow, who had taken this course, than one who had worked on a farm and had not taken it. We find it very effective, and it does not cost a great deal.

The courses that are being given, under the auspices of the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Agriculture, on the other side, are very practical. They have taken advantage of the Canadian views, and have Canadian and Australian machinery. They are sending men out to Australia as well as to Canada. In some instances, they have lectures delivered by Canadians. Members of our own staff, who are agricultural graduates, have given occasional lectures at these institutions. However, the difficulty is that you soon run up a heavy expense there. They are shortening their courses now and making them largely preparatory, simply long enough to determine whether a man is going to like farming, and long enough for the organization to find out whether he is going to be fitted for farm life.

Q. You were going to answer the question asked by Mr. Donnelly?—A. I meant to answer that in what I have just said, that it depends on the attitude of the man. Of course, if any kind of training has been given to the individual, before coming here, on an average the man who has worked on a farm ought to be more useful than the man who has come from the town or city. We must bear this in mind that in the British Isles there are a lot of people in the towns and villages who are only one or two generations removed from the farm. A lot of them are closely in touch with what is going on on farms over there. They know the life a farmer has to live.

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

I have samples of some of the literature that we use on the other side. Any advertising matter that we have not got, we have cabled for, and I hope it will be before you before these sessions are over. We have absolutely nothing to withhold from the Committee in regard to our activities. We have some samples here, and they could be spread around, so that if there are any questions to be asked at the next meeting, I shall be glad to attempt to answer them. We have a booklet here that is used in the British Isles entitled "Helping Settlers to Start in Canada." If the picture is too rosy of farm life, if there is any misrepresentation in it, or if any of the members of this Committee consider that it is unfair to the settler, I shall be pleased to hear from them at the next sitting.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Has not the tendency been to make the picture too rosy? I know how it was when I came out to Canada?—A. If it was extremely rosy in your case perhaps it was justified. I, perhaps, should speak for our own organization only. I can say that we are not engaged in painting any rosy picture for very good business reasons. Every time you paint a picture too rosy there is a reaction, and it comes back on you and you have to pay the piper. Insofar as painting the picture too rosy is concerned my observation has been that while it has undoubtedly been done, and may even occasionally be done yet, it is not being done by the Canadian Department of Immigration, or by the Canadian National Railways. I think I can be generous and say that I do not think it is being done by our competitor either. Most of the difficulties that we have encountered in Canada, in one form or another, in connection with immigration due to misrepresentations were traceable to steamship agents overseas. You may have a steamship agent out in a little village, somewhere in the British Isles, who has no interest in Canada at all. He is representing a steamship company and his only interest in Canada is to sell a ticket to Tom Jones to get on the boat. He may see that he has to say a little more that is favourable about the country, whether it is true or not, in order to make a sale, and a great deal of misrepresentation has taken place in days gone by at the instance of certain steamship agents. It is very hard to control that. We have discussed this question many times in London, as to what might be done. We have conferred with the British authorities on the question, because they could not be controlled by Canadian interests, being citizens of England, Ireland and Scotland. If the immigrant would always go to a recognized Canadian Immigration or Colonization institution, there would be no room for complaint. It may have been true in the old days, but it is not happening in our case, for the very good reason that we could not afford to let it happen.

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. That would only cover a limited number. The most of the immigrants come in touch with some of your officials, or those of the Canadian Pacific, or Immigration Department; these are only isolated cases, I presume? The other day I met a man who was having his hotel bill paid by a minister. This fellow said that the High Commissioner of Canada in London told him that if he came out here he could get a school to teach immediately. That may be correct, or may not be correct, but it is one case that will have to be examined.—A. I have had occasion, both when I was in the Department of Immigration and Colonization, as Deputy Minister, but more particularly since that time, in my present capacity, to investigate and have investigated, many cases of that kind. I never have a case reported to me in which it is alleged that any agent of the Canadian National Railways has misrepresented

facts to an individual, but it is immediately investigated. We will not keep any man in our employ who does that kind of thing. I have never yet found one of these cases to be true.

Q. How do these steamship agents operate?—A. They are men whose business it is to sell steamship tickets, and they usually represent all the steamship lines. They are professional steamship agents, and every man who comes to this country from the British Isles has to go to them to buy his ticket. They are trying to sell tickets all the time, and the steamship lines cannot always control them. If they censure a man for doing that kind of thing, he might discontinue selling tickets for that particular line, and sell them for another instead. There is no system for controlling them.

Q. The steamship lines are responsible for the actions of any person, or individual, that does business for them; they cannot escape that responsibility?—A. That is quite true. Following up what I said a moment ago, I have never found one of these cases yet that was true.

Q. Then it does not exist?—A. It does not exist, insofar as the responsible officials of Canadian institutions are concerned. But here is a peculiar thing about this that I should like to mention while we are on this point. It is the extraordinary tendency of the public mind to believe the story of the individual when there is a big corporation, or a government institution involved, we are always wrong, and the individual is always right.

Q. You are just speaking for the corporation, you are not speaking for the government; you are speaking for the Canadian National colonization scheme?—A. It is a matter of concern to all these institutions. Do you want me to confine myself to my own experience while with the Railway only or give you what I know of the subject.

Q. The Canadian National Railway, not the Government?—A. Of course, my experience is not confined to the Canadian National Railways.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: I think we may just as well understand now that Dr. Black was formerly the Deputy Minister of Immigration, and I think he is quite competent to give us his experience.

The WITNESS: I do not need to speak on behalf of the Department of Immigration at all, because the officers of it are quite capable of speaking on their own behalf, there is no doubt about that. I have every confidence in their being able to do that.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. I only had reference to that period when you were Deputy Minister, and your experience on that occasion.—A. I was speaking of this literature. We have samples here of the literature from the Scandinavian countries. I shall be glad to let anyone, who can read either Danish, Swedish, or Norwegian, see them, in order that you may know the care that we exercise in regard to our literature. Before the manuscript of each of these booklets was printed, it was submitted to the Government of the respective countries. This literature here, for Denmark, was submitted to the Department of Social Affairs of the Danish Government, and they went over it. I might say that the Government of all these countries are very jealous that there shall be no misrepresentation of the conditions in this country, that will cause any imposition to be suffered by their people who came here. As a result of this, we have been permitted to circulate this literature quite freely, in these countries, and it has had an exceedingly fine effect. We have been able to do some advertising but practically no lecturing is permitted in the Scandinavian countries. Sometimes there are lectures describing Canada, but not for the special purpose of trying to induce people to come to this Dominion. Most of the European countries, as I have said, are very careful in that regard.

(Dr. W. J. Black.)

In the non-preferred countries, we do no propaganda work at all, and we would not be permitted to do so. Someone asked the question a while ago, but I do not know whether the answer was clearly understood or not, as to the cost of our effort to get immigrants from these countries.

On the Continent, in the non-preferred countries, very little effort is required. The steamship lines with which we are associated, have applications from, or are able to locate far more people than we can take. Our Certificate Issuing Officers, whom I described to you a moment ago, examine these individuals to determine whether they are suitable for settlement in this country. We have very little expense, only that of maintaining these Certificate Issuing Officers, and we only have four who give all their time to the non-preferred countries. We have been able to get all the people from the non-preferred countries that we can handle.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Do you use the same literature in all countries?—A. It is practically the same, but, of course, we use different languages. We also have pamphlets prepared, describing different districts. If anyone would care to see these, I will leave them here. These are used in our offices in the Scandinavian countries, and in Germany, not only by ourselves, but by the steamship lines. Here is one, for instance, "Opportunities for Settlement of Scandinavians in Central British Columbia." There are photographs here of different points in the district, the homes, and a description of the farms. Here is another one, "Opportunities for Scandinavian Settlers along the Lines of the Canadian National Railways in Northern and Central Saskatchewan." Then we have one covering the German families in the St. Walburg district. "Opportunities for Swedish Settlers in the Maidstone District."

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Apparently we are spending a very great sum of money, through the Government and the railway and the different organizations, in order to induce settlers to come to Canada. In your opinion, would we get as good results if some of the money were expended in improving the condition of the farmer when he arrives here?—A. We will come to that later. I have a statement which will probably take half an hour to give, and I presume that there will not be time to deal with it to-day. I shall be glad to present it at the next meeting, if you desire it.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Do you give any assistance to industrial workers?—A. The Canadian National Railway are not giving any encouragement at all to any except agricultural workers. We are not making any effort, or spending a single dollar to induce any class of individual to come to Canada, except the agricultural and domestic classes. Notwithstanding the best effort, and the most careful selection that can be made, and the most complete assurance one can get that they will engage in farming, there is still a high percentage of these people who drift over into other occupations to about take care of the demand therein. The question is often asked why arrangements are not made to bring people of other classes from the non-preferred countries. I do not think that we need to do that at the present time. Of course, anyone may come from the British Isles who pays his fare, there is no difficulty about that, providing he is physically and mentally fit. Anyone may come from the Scandinavian countries,

and engage in mining, or anything else, if he is physically and mentally fit. The same applies to Germany, France, Belgium and Switzerland.

Q. But they get no assistance?—A. There is no assistance given by any institution that I know of.

Q. Or supervision?—A. Or supervision, for any occupation other than agriculture.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until Thursday, April 12th, at 11.00 a.m.

By Mr. Ross:

Q. Do you see the same literature in all countries? A. It is practically the same, but of course we use different languages. We also have pamphlets prepared describing different districts. If anyone would care to see these I will leave them here. These are used in our offices in the Scandinavian countries and to Germany, not only by ourselves, but by the steamship lines. Here is one, for instance, "Opportunities for Settlement of Scandinavians in Central British Columbia." There are photographs here of different points in the district, and a description of the farms. Here is another one, "Opportunities for Scandinavian Settlers Along the Line of the Canadian National Railway in Northern and Central Saskatchewan." Then we have one covering the German families in the St. Walburg district. "Opportunities for Swedish Settlers in the Manitoba District." You would understand all of these, wouldn't you?

Dr. J. J. McMillan: I have a question to ask you, Mr. Ross.

Q. Apparently we are spending a very great sum to money, through the Government and the railway and the different organizations, in order to induce settlers to come to Canada. In your opinion, would we get any good results if some of the money were expended in improving the conditions of the farmers who he arrives here?—A. We will come to that later. I have a statement which will probably take half an hour to give, and I presume that there will be time to deal with it to-day. I shall be glad to present it in the next meeting.

Q. If you desire to read any more books, each of us has a copy of the book, and you will find it all in German, law I. A. I understand that no one is to be paid to look after the business of the settlement, and that anyone who is to be paid, Mr. McMillan, or anyone else, would have to be paid out of the pocket of the Government.

Q. Do you give any assistance to industrial workers?—A. The Canadian National Railway are not giving any encouragement at all to any except agricultural workers. We are not taking any effort or spending a single dollar to induce any class of individual to come to Canada, except the agricultural and domestic classes. Nevertheless, the best effort and the most careful attention that can be made, and the most complete assistance can be given, they will engage in farming, there is still a high percentage of these people who drift over into other occupations to about take care of the demand therein. The question is often asked why arrangements are not made to bring people of other classes from the non-preferred countries. I do not think that we need do that at the present time. Of course, anyone may come from the British Isles who pays his fare, there is no difficulty about that, providing he is physically and mentally fit. Anyone may come from the Scandinavian countries.

The W. J. Black:

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, April 13, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have Dr. Black again this morning.

W. J. BLACK recalled.

The WITNESS: Gentlemen, at the meeting on the last day it was intimated to me that I would be expected to present to you my views as to what might be done toward solving the great problem of colonization. I have prepared and have here a brief outline which I should like to read to you if possible without interruption, and afterwards we might go over it clause by clause, if you wish. The reason I suggest this is that no doubt at the beginning some questions would be asked, which might not be raised if it were known that statements appearing later in the outline provided an answer.

I wish to say, too, that in presenting this outline I am doing so for the purpose of contributing, if possible, to a constructive consideration of the subject. I am not here to criticize anyone or any institution, because I do not feel like doing so.

I am familiar, to a certain extent, with the activities of the Canadian Department of Immigration but I do not know what the immediate plans of the Department are. I have no doubt that plans for improvement of conditions are under consideration and if there are features which are not to-day what this Committee might feel are just as they ought to be, I have no doubt but the Department is endeavouring to improve them.

Moreover, I am not going to present this outline to you with any pretense that it is entirely original. While the Department is no doubt dealing with this question in a manner which they have not communicated to me—and I have no right to expect that they would—much that I am about to present has been discussed more or less in other places heretofore.

My first statement is in relation to the present opinion of British people generally, in the British Isles, regarding what they consider Canada's attitude toward British immigration. There is public sentiment over there at the present time which has to be dealt with, and when we are discussing this clause later I shall explain more fully what I mean. The statement is as follows:—

1. That since the public of Great Britain appear to be of opinion that Canada is not anxious to encourage Britishers to come to this country, a special effort be made to convince them to the contrary. In this connection it is recommended:—

(a) That the medical and civil inspection be made as easily obtainable and as simple as possible, consistent with reasonable protection to Canada's interests.

(b) That the reduced passage rates be continued for the movement of juveniles and families migrating to engage in farming, but that for single men arrangements be made for a flat rate of £10 or £12, and that to this class there be no occupational test. This will enable single men to move freely, the only restriction being the medical and general examination. The same rate should apply to transportation in the reunion of families where the father or head of the family is established in Canada.

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

2. In order that opportunities for engaging successfully in farming may be increased and the lack of housing accommodation for such families in rural districts may be partially met, it is proposed that the Federal government of Canada establish a fund of \$4,500,000 to be made available \$1,500,000 per year for each of the next three years to provide for loans for the erection of workers' cottages on the farms of those who will apply for such loans and who may be considered eligible for such consideration.

Under this scheme farmers desiring British farm help would make application for loans for the erection of cottages. An agreement between the farmer and the Federal Immigration Department would be necessary and would include the setting aside of one acre of land for the purpose, the erection of a family cottage and a small shed providing accommodation for one cow, a few poultry, and two or more pigs; no loan to exceed a maximum of \$1,500 and to be repayable in equal annual instalments over a period of from 5 to 10 years without interest if paid when due; otherwise interest to be payable at the usual rates.

These cottages would provide homes for families while gaining Canadian experience who would later take land on their own account, and this they would be expected to do within a period of two years in order that the cottages might become available for other immigrants.

3. For the purpose of greatly increasing the number of families becoming settled on new lands it is recommended that so long as the public lands of the prairie provinces are under the control of the Federal government, they be placed under the administration of the Department of Immigration and Colonization instead of the Department of the Interior as at present. Public lands form one of the main attractions for prospective land settlers and obviously should be administered by the Department primarily interested in immigration and land settlement. While undeveloped they constitute a dead asset; if made to produce they become of great value to the state and its institutions.

With the public lands under the control of the Department of Immigration I would recommend:—

- (a) That the present homestead regulations be cancelled and that all public lands close enough to a railway now existing or projected to justify their use for farming be examined and a physical description made available; only those lands on which a settler can be expected to succeed to be offered for settlement.
- (b) That there be reserved seventy-five per cent of the lands for Canadians and immigrants from the British Isles.
- (c) That lands be available to those only who are shown by examination to be physically and financially qualified to make progress in farming, preference being given to married men with families able to help.
- (d) That negotiations be undertaken with the Overseas Settlement Committee of Great Britain for loans for qualified immigrants from the British Isles to be settled on the public lands, loans amounting to a maximum of £250 to be desirable.

4. As affecting lands privately owned, whose owners desire assistance to find settlers therefor, and within reasonable distance of railways either built or projected it is recommended as follows:—

- (a) That they be listed and settled as and when owners agree to dispose of them at prices considered reasonable by the Department of Immigration and when this Department has suitable settlers who desire them, the terms of sale to be on a suitable standard contract; no cash

payment; taxes only for the first two years, and the purchase prices under amortized payments at six per cent interest covering 15 or 20 years.

- (b) That the Overseas Settlement Committee be approached with a proposal to assist in settling British families on such lands by providing loans amounting to £300 in each case, the loans, expenditures and supervision to be provided and dealt with as in the case of the 3,000 families scheme.

5. As affecting continental immigration of single men from non-preferred countries and in order to avoid congestion and consequent unemployment in Canada, it is recommended:—

- (a) That the nomination system be confined to the following degrees: Father or mother, husband or wife, son or daughter, brother or sister, uncle or aunt, of persons now engaged in farming in Canada.
- (b) That all steamship agents or persons engaged in soliciting signatures to applications for admission of immigrants from non-preferred countries be licensed, and that a proper penalty be applied in case of misrepresentation.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You said you were going over that outline paragraph by paragraph?—

A. Yes. No. 1 again:—

“That since the public of Great Britain appear to be of opinion that Canada is not anxious to encourage Britishers to come to this country a special effort should be made to convince them to the contrary.”

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. How do you account for them having obtained that impression when we are giving them more assistance than we have ever done before?—A. I will explain that, and I am conscious that I am only giving my views, as well as being under oath. A good deal of the feeling which has grown up in the British Isles—

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Before you start on that: there is an assumption there that that is true. Will you give us, first, why you make that assumption? What evidence have you that that is a fact?—A. Yes, that is a fact, and I consider that a very proper question. Anyone who has been reading the British papers in the last three months has no doubt whatever of that. I do not know whether we have them here or not, but we can produce a great many clippings from leading papers of the British Isles showing that that is true. It is clearly being indicated and is a source of disturbance to all of us who are engaged in this work.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. By private letters?—A. No, in the press. I am not referring to private letters. It is appearing in statements of incidents occurring which the press consider indicate this situation.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. Do you think it is systematic propaganda from any source to try to stop immigration?—A. There always is apparent from time to time evidences of propaganda, more or less organized.

Mr. EGAN: May I ask a question, although not a member of parliament, but having been a witness?

The CHAIRMAN: What is the wish of the committee?

Several MEMBERS: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: You may ask the question, Mr. Egan.

By Mr. Egan:

Q. Is it not a fact, Mr. Black, that that which has been in evidence in the old country press in the last two months is more or less of a repetition of a certain letter originally appearing in the *Times* of London? I do not know whether your reading has put you in a position to answer that.—A. I think there is something in that, too. I do not think, however, it is due mainly to that. I will give you my view as to why I think public opinion is as it is. I believe conditions arising from the reduced passage rate are largely responsible for it.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. And the regulations connected with it?—A. Yes. Now, no country should be expected to subsidize the entry of people within its borders as we do in this case, without being expected to examine these people carefully. I think that is generally conceded. I believe it is generally conceded also by the people in the British Isles who really think about this matter and are devoid of prejudice. The best possible effort must be made to ensure that the individual is of a type who can succeed in farming when he comes here, and that, generally, he is physically and mentally fit—I do not mean by that that a man must not be mentally weak, but rather that his mental attitude is right. I spoke of that the last day. It is also necessary to make reasonably sure that the individual will engage in farming when he gets here. I do not recall whether it has come before you yet or not in this committee, but it is a fact that a good many of those single men who were assisted last year, notwithstanding careful selection, refused to go on the farms when they arrived. My own Department had that experience, I am sorry to say, notwithstanding our best efforts made to avoid it. A certain percentage will not go on farms when they arrive notwithstanding their promise to do so. This feature has to be considered, and there has to be a careful examination in any case. I am not making this statement in defence of the examination which the Canadian Department of Immigration is conducting over there. I am not here to defend at all. That is not my business. In fact, I am not quite sure but I might change it in some respects. I have not made up my mind just at the moment to tell you wherein I would do so, but the fact is that the examination has to be of a character such as indicated and enough applicants have been turned back to leave the impression that Canada does not want these people. After living over there for a year and being in close contact with the situation all the time, for the last five years, that is my conclusion as to the chief reason why residents of the British Isles believe Canada does not want them.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. Do you think that entry examination, which we all admit is necessary, more than offsets the advantage we get by reason of the assisted passage which necessitates the examination?—A. I think perhaps it does. I have already mentioned to you the reduced passage rates, but I want to say, first of all, this: that since the people of Canada are interested in getting as many British people to settle here as possible, for reasons which I need not discuss, I think we ought to consider going the limit toward endeavouring to overcome the particular sentiment to which I refer. We should not only go our limit in that regard, but do everything also within reason to make it perfectly clear that

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

we do want the British people to come to this country, people who can be settled into our lives and activities under existing conditions.

I think everything possible should be done, and that is why I have suggested—as you will find in another clause—that there should be a flat rate for transportation of single men as it is there that most of the trouble lies. Most of the families who are passed to come here go on the land. A family can not run away, as a single man can, so there is not much difficulty in regulating the movements and effecting the proper placement of families from the British Isles subsidized to come here. The system of juvenile immigration also which has been built up is, I consider, pretty generally satisfactory.

I know that the Department has plans—I do not recall whether they have been placed before you yet or not, but I know they are public—for the purpose of encouraging young men, who come to Canada to work, to eventually settle on farms of their own. All that is constructive and to the good. The family scheme also is commendable as far as it goes, but when it comes to single men the situation is different. We will have to have, in my judgment, a flat ocean rate that will justify eliminating the occupational examination and enable a greater number to come forward.

I wish to say to you that there has not been a time either in winter or summer in nearly five years, since the Canadian National Railways established its colonization department, when we have been able to fill the demand for British farm help.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I had a question asked me in the House of Commons about eight men who were sent to Kingston for farm work, and not one of them went. That is the trouble.—A. That occurs notwithstanding the best efforts of those engaged in this business. It is bound to occur. It is a very disappointing feature of our activities—but it occurs.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Mr. Black, do you think that the best investment the government can make is to be able to assure the farmer of British farm help, and do you think that such rigid examination would be needed inasmuch as we are making this investment?—A. I do.

Q. Do you think that it should be less rigid?—A. I want to make myself clear, Mr. Stewart, in answering your question, in which the phrase “rigid examination” is used. I think that we must be careful to see that we do not encourage people to come here who are physically unfit to engage in farming. There must be a sufficient medical examination to see to that, and we must make reasonably sure that they are mentally sound. I have said, in my notes here, that I think the examination should be made as simple as possible. By “simple” I do not necessarily mean that the medical examination should be less careful.

Q. Are you of the opinion that that reduction in passage rates, a portion of which the Government must pay, should be extended to all classes of unmarried men coming to Canada?—A. I am not in favour of that reduction being extended to all-comers, because I think that Canada’s contribution per individual is too great to be applied to all and sundry.

Q. If it is to be applied simply to farm help, wherein is the advantage of the examination, having in mind the large number that you admit, and everybody else admits, do not go into farm employment, but simply take advantage of the low rate to get to Canada?—A. Well, there are many to-day who object to the examination.

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Why do they object?—A. There are various reasons at the present time, Mr. Forke. Two references are required, and I find that, in my experience, to be a serious restricting factor. For instance, a man may be working on a farm, and he has to get two references. He probably has worked on this farm ever since he started to work, and there may be very few persons to whom he can go for a reference. Obviously, he should go to his employer for it, but he does not wish his employer to know that he would like to migrate to Canada. He does not know whether he might not be turned down later on, and, in that case, his boss would probably have found somebody else to take his job.

Q. It is not a medical examination?—A. I am not speaking alone of the medical examination. If you wish me to speak of that, I will do so.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. Just follow up that line.—A. He hesitates about putting in an application at all, for that reason. He feels that he may get into trouble, if he does, and finds himself out of a job.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Is that simply a reference as to character alone?—A. Yes, it is mainly a reference as to character, but it calls for the names of previous employers. I am sorry I have not a copy here.

Mr. EGAN: There are only two references asked for, and he may never mention his employer.

The WITNESS: We find that that is one of the chief restricting factors.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. How do you get over the fact that the reference must be given by the applicant, and then the agent makes inquiries to find out if the applicant is all right?—A. My own opinion is that one reference is just as good as two. If one is bad, two will be bad, or just about as likely to be.

Q. Would you make the agent responsible for finding out if the party is all right?—A. It would be a good thing if he could do that in all cases, but where you are handling a big movement it is difficult to have enough agents to go around and look after all cases. The application is made, and then the individual is told about the medical examination and where he can see the agent of the Department. After the examination is complete, each case has to be dealt with from London. When the examiner is through with a case he cannot tell the individual whether he will be able to come to Canada. Although he has passed him, the references still have to be considered at London, and a delay occurs there. The delay is not always entirely due to the Department, although it may be criticized for it, but is often due to individuals themselves. These individuals are apt to be slow in the handling of their correspondence, and there is a good deal of delay that the Department is not responsible for. It would be a good thing if the whole thing could be simplified, so that Canada's interests could be adequately protected. This might be arranged by giving the agent of the Department, in the field, authority so that when he completes his examination he would be in position to tell the individual that he could come to Canada. That is done by Australia.

Q. Just what would you suggest in the way of simplifying that, so that when a man makes his application he would be assured, within a week or ten days, that he could get his passage to Canada?—A. You cannot exactly assure him that in a week or ten days his application would be through, because, under the system of medical inspection, he probably would have to wait until the medical examiner would appear in his nearest district.

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Could you tell us how our system differs from that of Australia and New Zealand, so that we can understand why there is a feeling that we do not want them in Canada, and yet they want them in Australia and New Zealand?—A. The chief difference between Australia and Canada, as I see it, is just along the line I am speaking of. The Australian system appears to be more simple. They only ask for one reference, and there is only one examination for applicants going to Australia. Their medical examination takes place at the same time as the examination to determine whether an applicant is qualified with regard to occupation. The whole thing is co-ordinated.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I have the returns from the civil examinations, and the medical examinations, and perhaps seventy-five per cent of all examinations take place at the same time.

The WITNESS: I knew that you would be coming to that, and that is why I made the reference, at the beginning of this statement, that the Department was working toward improvement of these things. A good deal of the difficulty that has occurred in the past has been due to lack of co-ordination. I am not sure that it would be possible to have one hundred per cent co-ordination, but your Department has undoubtedly made improvement in the last few weeks, there is no doubt about that. But I do think that, on the same day that the agent of the Department of Immigration and Colonization makes his examination, it should be possible for the District Agent to say whether an applicant is to be permitted to come to Canada, instead of referring it to London.

Mr. EGAN: Have the Australians district agents?

The WITNESS: They have agents that examine in the districts but not resident agents. They go out into the districts, but they are not resident, as our's are, but the effect is the same in that regard.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. With a man going to Australia, when the medical examination is completed, the examination by the agent of the Australian Government takes place at the same time, and the agent of the Australian Government can tell the applicant, at that moment, whether or not they are going to accept him?—A. Yes, he has the authority to say to him right there, before he leaves the office, whether or not he will be admitted to Australia. That system has been, to a large extent, responsible for the popularity of the Australian method of handling this business in the Old Country.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Have you any criticism to offer with regard to the medical examination that is made of British immigrants, and if so, what is it?—A. The medical examination of British immigrants has not been going on very long. As far as answering the question as to whether it may be too rigid, or not rigid enough, I have no criticism to offer regarding that; I do not know whether it is or not.

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. The public opinion, as it exists in Great Britain, was created by the regulations as they were, not as they have been in the last few weeks?—A. Are you asking me that question?

Q. The public opinion in Great Britain, which we all know is more favourable to Australia and New Zealand than to Canada, was created through the past regulations, which apparently were more rigid and more personal? Visits had to be made by the applicants to doctors, and so on, but things have been improved within the last few weeks. I just want to mention that it is

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

the old regulations that have created this public opinion. While I am on this subject, I might say that the Salvation Army, which knows as much about immigration as the Parliament of Canada, or any other institution, have stated that if it was left to them they could get 100,000 immigrants. I think Commissioner Lamb made that statement. Perhaps the Minister would consider getting in touch with Commissioner Lamb, and getting some suggestion from him. When you were going along and stating what the public opinion is in Great Britain, the Minister was very careful to check you up. During the last few weeks there have been changes made. I was on the train the other day with a young man from Wales, who was coming up to a farmer in my riding. He and his chum simply walked off the boat at one of the Canadian ports, and they were not examined, but he was examined twice in the Old Country. I understand you to say that Australia only examines them once, and only asks for one reference from the employer, not two. In the Old Country, people work 30, 40, or 50 years for the one man; they are very conservative. Australia only asks for one reference, and you say that we ask for two; is it from two employers that you ask references?—A. Not necessarily two employers.

Q. One employer, but two references?—A. Two references, but not necessarily employers. It has been suggested that someone get in touch with Commissioner Lamb. I might say that I am in touch with him at the present time, in fact, very much so, in regard to the very matter to which reference has been made. Commissioner Lamb took exception to the statement which I made before this Committee the last day, that the British race was not showing quite the same genius for pioneering that they had showed in the last generation. This statement was transmitted by Reuters to the Old Country, and it was transmitted correctly, because I had it checked. I have been endeavouring to get Commissioner Lamb's statement as to the number of settlers that he can supply, are qualified to settle on the land in Canada, under existing conditions. That was the problem I was dealing with when I made that statement. I am not aware that Commissioner Lamb has had any experience in putting people on the land in Canada, or in settling people under pioneering conditions; I have never heard of it. The Salvation Army, in my judgment, has done very excellent work, and I have no criticism to make of that at all. However, when we enter this particular field, I want this matter kept straight, and I want it understood. If Commissioner Lamb has any number of families that can be settled, under conditions as they exist at the present time, the Canadian National Railway will be delighted to lend itself to assisting them in getting settled, insofar as reasonable assistance is concerned. I do not mean that they would be supplied with money; I mean assisting the people who can settle under pioneering conditions? Pioneering conditions are not conditions where the individual is supplied with a certain amount of money, provided with a house and equipment, and all that kind of thing; that is not pioneering at all. Anyone can settle under those conditions, but where they have to go out and settle themselves after they get here, after receiving reasonable direction. That is another matter.

Q. You have notified Commissioner Lamb?—A. I have been trying for a week, to get him to cable an answer to my question.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Do the Australians employ more agents in the Old Country than the Canadian Government?—A. Australia has a different system altogether. You can hardly say that they have agents, in the same sense that Canada has. The Canadian system of having district agents is, in my judgment, superior to that of Australia. Canada's effort to actually get close to the people in the Old Country, and to be near them so that they the people, can come to them at

any time to get information is, in my judgment, a better system than that of Australia. Australia has one central institution in London, and they send field men out all over the British Isles, but they are not stationed at particular places outside London.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Your last statement, in connection with examinations, was a little misleading, though I do not think it was intentional. There is a difference between a centralized system in London and one where the agents are always situated in the one district, where they are in closer touch with the people?—A. The Australian system, as far as examinations are concerned, is not inconsistent at all with our Canadian system and organization.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. What is the comparison between the number going to Australia from Great Britain, and the number coming to Canada?—A. I do not believe I could give you that correctly.

Q. Approximately.—A. I have not the figures. I believe that Australia has gained on Canada in the last year or so.

Mr. EGAN: It is in one of the reports.

The WITNESS: My impression has been that Australia has been very much behind Canada, but it is also my impression that Australia has been gaining on us.

Mr. EGAN: There was one three-month period in the last four years.

The WITNESS: We must bear in mind that Canada is much closer to the British Isles. We have a very decided advantage; there is no question about that.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. You are satisfied that the procedure now adopted by the Canadian Government is more satisfactory than that adopted by the Australians, but you wish that to be simplified in some degree, so that the applicant can come before the agent and be assured in a very short time that he can get passage to Canada?—A. You have not got what I intended to say. I said that the Canadian system and organization, in so far as district offices are concerned, is superior to that of Australia, but I prefer the Australian system of examination to the Canadian system.

Q. You think that there can be a further simplification?—A. Yes. The examination has to be made, in order to be sure that those who are coming to this country, under the reduced passage rates, are going to engage in agriculture. I believe that this has been more responsible for the present feeling than anything else. Then there is the question of rates, and I make this recommendation:—

“That the reduced passage rates be continued for the movement of juveniles and families migrating to engage in farming, but that for single men arrangements be made for a flat rate of £10 or £12, and that to this class there be no occupational tests.”

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. What is the present rate?—A. The present rate is \$82.50.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. What is that in pounds sterling?—A. I have not the figures in English currency; it is \$82.50.

Mr. GLEN: It would be £16 something.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Do you know what the rate to Australia is?—A. I have not that here. Australia has been subsidizing the movement more heavily than Canada, and has been spending more money to try to get people. It want to make myself clear when I say that I do not believe that Canada should spend any more money than she is spending at the present time. I am not in favour of the expenditure of large sums of money for purposes of this sort.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. Does it not work out that the more we subsidize the less we get?—A. That is what I would get away from. My own judgment is that Canada has gone as far as she ought to go in the way of subsidizing people to come here. I am connected with a railway in the settlement business, and we have a side line in the traffic department, but we are not concerned with the money to be made out of hauling immigrants from the seaboard to their destination. However, when there is any of that business to be done we intend to have our share of it, but it is not the policy of the Canadian National Railways to make money out of hauling immigrants inland. One of our difficulties, and one that has a great bearing upon British immigration, is the cost of getting to Canada. I am not here to criticize the rates, nor to deal with the question of whether they are too high. I have no opinion to express on that, but the fact is that the rates are about three times as high as they were in the days before the war. The people overseas who ought to come to Canada have not got any more money than they had in those days, if they have as much. Every dollar that they spend to get here, over what they spent in days gone by, means that they have just that much less when they arrive here to get settled. My own opinion is that our steamship lines have gone a little too far in their race to provide fine accommodation. The third-class accommodation that is supplied to-day to the newcomers to this country is very much superior to what anybody, of any class, looked for a generation or two back. In other words, our immigrants coming here would be better off if they had accommodation that did not cost so much, or that did not cost the steamship companies so much to supply. I do not know whether the steamship companies can give lower rates or not, but I would like to see an average rate of from £10 to £12 for people coming from the British Isles. In this connection, I should say that only about one-third of the people brought to Canada from Great Britain by the Canadian National Railways in 1927 received the reduced passage rate. In other words, two-thirds of them came here and paid the regular fare because they were not eligible under the reduced passage fare. A good many of these people were coming to friends, and settled with friends. Just while I am on that point, I want to make an observation which I did not make last day, and which I think has a direct relationship to this whole matter. A large percentage of the best people who come to this country, from either the British Isles or anywhere else, come to it through the influence of friends or relatives who are already here. They are the easiest people to settle, and we never have much trouble with them. They do not usually become public charges. Sometimes the question is raised as to why the British people are so anxious to get into the United States. I was not able to answer that question to my own satisfaction until I lived over there. There are at least four times as many people born in the British Isles now resident in the United States, as are resident in Canada. In other words, there are about four times as many families in the United States to-day who have relatives in the British Isles, and who are ready to interest them in the opportunities for better living in the United States, than there are in Canada.

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I do not wish to put you off there, but I would like to remark right here that the immigrants from Great Britain to the United States this year are well within the quota.

Mr. EGAN: It has been less than half for the last two months.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: There have not been as many going to the United States as could get in under the quota.

The WITNESS: I am very glad to hear that. Of course, one reason for that is the lack of opportunity in the United States in the last few months, as far as work is concerned. Nevertheless, that feature must be considered. We have had comparatively few people come to Canada from Ireland in the last twenty-five years, particularly from the south of Ireland. When you look for the reason why they are not coming now you will find that the reason is lack of close family relationship between Canada and Ireland.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Does the Australian government subsidize immigrants from the United Kingdom who go to Australia? Do they give them cheap passage rates?—
A. They give them cheap passage rates.

Q. For the single individual?—A. For the single individual.

Q. For farm labourers or otherwise?—A. Farm labourers.

Q. Just farm labourers?

Mr. EGAN: All immigrants.

The WITNESS: Mr. Egan says "all immigrants". I was not aware of that. However, he knows that better than I do. I was not quite sure on that point.

As an example of the competition in that regard, New Zealand, for instance, has been giving free passage to domestics. Any young woman who will enlist for domestic work in New Zealand and who is physically and medically fit, gets free passage to that country. They have been spending a good deal of money over there for that class of business.

If there are no further questions on this clause, I will go on.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. In regard to the two-thirds who come "off their own bat" from the British Isles: is there any complaint about their examination?—A. I have nothing specific to give you on that point.

Q. It is less strict?—A. It has been.

Q. There has been no particular complaint about that?—A. No.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. The medical examination would not be less strict?—A. No. No matter what their occupation is, if they are paying the full passage they are entitled to come.

Now, I come to the clause referring to housing. This matter was brought before you a few days ago by Mr. Macalister. This is the only proposal I have to make for providing a fund from the treasury of Canada. I do not care very much about doing that, as I have already indicated to you, because I am not in favour of spending large sums of public money for purposes of this kind. This is not, however, a case of spending money; it is a case of providing a loan, and I have no doubt that the Overseas Settlement Committee would be quite prepared to assist Canada in so far as a scheme of this kind for the settlement of British people is concerned. The amount I have suggested is not large and would not take care of probably more than one thousand families a year. If we could assure the farmers of this country who wish to employ British help that they would get it, many would build houses themselves.

We have been working on this particular problem for a couple of years to see if we could not find a solution of it without spending money, and we now know that if we could assure farmers that they would get British families for employment from year to year, they would erect houses themselves. There are a great many cases of that kind.

My suggestion under the proposed scheme is that the cottages be erected under the control of the farmer; that is, that farmers themselves should have an interest in them, because if you do not do that they will not be protected when they are vacant and will become more or less destroyed.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. And the only man to do that is the owner of the property?—A. Yes, the owner of the property. Of course there will arise a difficulty occasionally wherein the farmer will not find the worker congenial and will not care for him, or the worker will not care for the farmer. In these cases it will be the business of the representative of the Department of Immigration—perhaps the Land Settlement field men—to adjust the difficulties and move men to places where they may get on better. All these things have to be done, but it is quite practicable to do it.

I come now to the question regarding the transfer of public lands—

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Where would you build these houses? Would you build them all over the country, in every province, or have the farmer borrow the money, or what?—A. They would have to be built in any province of Canada where a farmer made application, and where it would appear to be desirable that such a scheme should be encouraged.

Q. Would you take a mortgage for that loan?—A. From the farmer?

Q. Yes.—A. There would have to be a mortgage. The lending party would have to be secured, of course—

By Mr. Egan:

Q. On two or three acres of ground?—A. I do not think it should be a large amount of land, but the security would have to be on the land and on the buildings. I am not suggesting that the security would be of the very best, but you would be encouraging a scheme for the settlement of British people, providing a base where they could settle and afterward go on the land of their own.

Our great difficulty at the present time is to find houses wherein to house British families. It is the "piece de resistance" of our whole effort to find houses in which to place people who can be obtained, and who have not money or capital enough to settle on their own account. There are very few obtainable in the British Isles who have.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Mr. Black, I have not got it quite clear in my own mind what you propose. Is it this? That the farmer make application, if he is desirous of having a cottage on his farm, and then the Government would undertake to loan him the money which he would employ for the erection of that cottage?—A. That is it.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Mr. Black, would you state that he must place a British immigrant in that cottage? The condition in western Canada at the present time is that many of use are not able to take on married men. What would we do with a man who would avail himself of a job, we will say, with me, but who is not British, if I have not the accommodation for him?—A. You mean not British?

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

Q. Good Canadians?—A. I think this scheme would have to be made elastic in that respect. I think if they were Canadian citizens and you were employing them to work on your farm, this system would have to apply to them as well.

Q. That is the big difficulty to-day. Pick up some of the western papers, the *Grain Growers' Guide* or *The Northwest Farmer*, and you will see many instances of married men applying for jobs, where separate cottages are provided, and they cannot get them.—A. It is a question, when you come to deal with the Canadian citizens, whether the provincial governments' responsibility does not arise in so far as the loan to the farmers is concerned. That is a question, however, which I am not prepared to discuss just at the moment, but these cottages should be built for a specific purpose, that is, for the settlement of British settlers. I think the plan should be limited to that class.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Have you any more details of this scheme?—A. I have a memorandum which elaborates it a little, but I had not intended reading it. However, I will if you wish.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. What actually happens in the West is this: supposing a farmer wishes to build one of these cottages, and he has a mortgage on his farm. How do you propose to give title to the Board and get that land away from the mortgage? Then, if you get to that point where a farmer can give title to the Board, and the cottage is erected and later on it is found unnecessary for the farmer to continue using it because he has sons coming up, what will you do with the cottage? Will it be taken off that land and put somewhere else?—A. There will be occasional cases of that kind arise.

Q. No "occasional", no. That will invariably happen all through the entire West.—A. That the farmer's son would take charge of the place and not require help?

Q. A farmer has his own farm and has his sons coming up, and the cottage becomes useless so far as that farm is concerned. It would then become useless as far as the Board is concerned?—A. I do not think these cottages would be so large that they could not be moved without difficulty if desired.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Does your note deal with the principle at all?—A. It deals with the details. I will read it if you wish.

Q. That perhaps is a matter which will cause more discussion than anything else—the question of housing assistance.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Mr. Black; I take it that your idea is that the farmers would repay these loans and then own the property.—A. Yes.

Q. The details for protecting these loans, and so forth, you are not familiar with?—A. I had not intended going into those details at the present time.

Q. You made the suggestion here of the action you would have to take in regard to British families coming to this country during the period when the loan was still on the property.—A. Yes, to give the British family a home.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Do your details meet the suggestion that the Canadian farm workers should be entitled to the same privileges?—A. I do not recall that. I will read these details if you wish.

Mr. DONNELLY: Yes, let us have them.

The WITNESS (Reading): "It is an axiom of colonization work that the successful placement of one family is of greater value than the placement of a great many single men. The single man is footloose, comes often as an experiment, is easily tempted to move on, and can in no case be counted as a permanent settler until he takes up land. Even then he cannot be regarded as definitely settled on the land until he is married; bachelor farmers seldom succeed. The essence of real colonization is the establishment of homes, and homes require families. True, single farm labourers do in many instances eventually establish homes on the land, but the wastage into the cities and into industrial occupations is enormous. Schemes entailing assistance, financial or otherwise, should therefore be mainly directed to the recruitment and placement of families. Employment is required for at least a year in the case of families with little experience or capital, and even families with some experience and capital will have a better chance of eventual success if found farm employment during their first year in Canada.

Considering first British families it may be taken for granted that under present conditions only those with fairly extensive experience and at least one thousand dollars available capital have a reasonable chance of success on land of their own. Such families are few and far between. I doubt in fact if more than three hundred per year can be recruited in Great Britain by all agencies working there, but if complete arrangements for reception and placement can be made we could expect at least ten times as many inexperienced or partly experienced families with little or no capital. It is for the accommodation of this class we must provide if we intend to increase our permanent British farm population. Their requirements are: 1. Farm employment; 2. Housing accommodation.

In surveying the farm employment field it has been found that every year there is a large demand for British farm help from almost every province in Canada. In some cases inexperienced men are required and in most cases such men will be accepted if experienced help is not available, and a large proportion of these applications cannot be filled as the supply of British farm labourers is always less than the demand. Those farmers who are not successful in obtaining British workers are forced to accept help of some other nationality or in the alternative curtail their seasons' operations, and get along with temporary help in the rush seasons. An increase in the movement of British single men would to a large extent meet this situation from the employers' viewpoint, but it would not result in any proportionate increase in permanent land settlement and in any case the supply of single men ready and willing to come appears to be limited. Even the low rates granted during the last two years have not had the desired effect. On the other hand quite large numbers of married couples and families, large or small, experienced and inexperienced, present themselves to various offices in Great Britain for employment in Canada. As matters now stand very few of these can be accepted although there is undoubtedly employment on our farms for thousands. And the only important reason for refusing these desirable settlers, or rather for refusing to accept the responsibility for their placement, is lack of housing accommodation.

The average farmer has only one set of buildings and realizes the inconvenience of keeping a strange family in his own home, even if it be large enough; consequently he asks for a single man although if accommodation could be provided he would prefer the married man as being less likely to leave him without good cause, and more interested in making progress towards eventual independence. Any proposal to provide or assist in providing separate housing accommodation in rural districts for working families is therefore worthy of serious consideration. A solution of this difficulty will surely be an important step in the direction of increasing British settlement. Officers of my Depart-

ment have been aware of this situation for some time, and about a year ago did outline to an organization specially interested in British immigration a scheme to provide such housing. At that time quite a large number of responsible farmers expressed their willingness to erect separate buildings if it could be done cheaply, the cost spread over a few years, and some assurance given that they would get a suitable family. Some financing is required, however, which has not yet been arranged and as a fairly large investment will be needed it is hardly likely that private interests could handle it on a big scale. The main provisions of the scheme as we have recently revised it are: 1. An intensive canvass of all farmers likely to need British farm help for yearly employment, but unable at present to do so on account of lack of adequate housing accommodation. It is fully expected that this will reveal opportunities for the placement of at least one thousand families per year during the next three years. 2. The establishment of a fund of \$4,500,000 to be made available \$1,500,000 per year during the next three years to be used in making loans to such farmers for the erection of separate buildings on the following conditions:—

Loans—(a) To cover the actual cost of material and supplies used in constructing, fitting and furnishing the proposed buildings and in no case to exceed \$1,500 to any one farmer.

(b) To be conditional on the execution of an approved agreement to allow free occupation of the buildings to a family of British or Canadian origin, and to employ such family on his farm on fair conditions to be agreed upon with the controlling organization.

(c) To be repayable in equal annual instalments over a period of from five to ten years as desired without interest.

Buildings—(a) To be erected on the employer's farm in a convenient place with water supply; one acre of land to be fenced with the buildings and to be prepared for planting a garden. The organization advancing the funds to have a lien (similar to a seed grain lien) on the one acre, the buildings and furniture until all advances have been repaid.

(b) Buildings to comprise a house suitable for a family of five persons and a shed or barn sufficient to accommodate two head of stock, one litter of pigs and a small number of chickens, both to be erected according to plans prepared or approved by the controlling organization. The maximum loan is provided for farmers who could give employment to more than one worker and who would therefore erect a house to accommodate a larger family.

(c) Buildings to be insured in favour of the controlling organization which should have all the usual rights of a mortgagee.

Supervision.—The controlling organization should have charge of: (a) Canvassing for prospective employers; (b) Investigating responsibility and suitability of prospective employers; (c) Arranging and paying out loans; (d) Directing suitable families, either British or Canadian; (e) Arranging employment contracts; (f) Moving unsuitable families; (g) Adjusting disputes between employer and worker; (h) Collecting payments on loans.

Advantages of Scheme.—(a) Materially enlarges field for employment of British and Canadian farm help;

(b) Provides for employment of families likely later to take land on their own account and available for any land settlement schemes operated in the future;

(c) Provides farmer with dependable, all-the-year-round help;

(d) Employer will have personal interest in buildings (his labour and eventual ownership) assuring that they will be well cared for;

(e) Low cost, being interest only on funds employed, plus cost of supervision;

(f) Annual repayments after three years should constitute a revolving fund for continued operation on the same lines if results justify;

(g) Assures worker satisfactory treatment and security for wages, as employer found to be satisfactory borrower should for some reasons be satisfactory employer. Controlling organization holding contract with employer should also be in a position to insist on proper treatment of worker;

(h) Provides for the same assistance to British or Canadian families already here as is offered to new-comers.

Co-operation.—The scheme entails active recruitment of British families by the controlling organization or some other responsible agency co-operating closely with it, as it will be necessary to maintain a constant balance between the number of families available and the number of building and employment contracts entered into in order to insure help for every employer who builds.

It is anticipated that active assistance would be given in Canada by many organizations interested in British settlement to induce suitable farmers to take advantage of the scheme and to assist families on arrival.

Financing.—Such a scheme if sponsored here by the government would appear to come within the scope of operations of the Overseas Settlement Committee, who might therefore be expected to share in providing the funds on a 50-50 basis.

Rates.—All British families brought forward under this scheme should have the benefit of the assisted passage rate.

These are all the details we have worked out regarding this scheme.

The next question before us is that referring to the transfer of public lands, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Immigration. I appreciate that probably I am treading on rather thin ice when I bring that up—

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I will tell you that you are on thin ice indeed. Be careful.

The WITNESS: Yes, but since it is my opinion, and I regard it as one of the important factors in the consideration of this question, I thought it proper I should place it before you.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Mr. Black, as I understand your suggestions, as I have listened to them, they are in respect to the utilization of the land still available in the northwest, and I think you might fairly give us your frank opinion without regard to the question of whether it is expedient to transfer the land from one Department to another, or as to the rights of the province, because if your suggestions are pertinent, no doubt there could be complete co-operation in regard to this.

The WITNESS: Yes. The fourth question is in regard to assistance on land privately owned. There is nothing new about that. I told you on the last day when appearing before you of the activities of our own Land Settlement Association, in placing people on privately-owned lands.

The only addition to that outline is the suggestion here that the Overseas Settlement Committee might be induced to assist in the settlement of British people on such lands, where it is desirable that they should be settled. Generally speaking, British families who have no money of their own ought to be settled, if possible, on public land. There is a lot of public land yet available in various districts not very far distant from railways which is of good quality, and I consider arrangements might be made to facilitate their settlement.

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

Now, I come to the question of continental immigration. I am very strongly of the opinion that we should check the system that now prevails of soliciting applications for people from non-preferred countries. The representatives of the steamship companies are all in competition in this business. A sum of money is paid for securing the applications and my experience last year was—and I anticipate the very same condition this year if there should be continued bad weather in Western Canada during the early part of the summer—that a large percentage of the congestion and unemployment in our towns and villages was caused by individuals who had come out on nominated applications from non-preferred countries. There are very few farmers—comparatively speaking—who sign these applications who expected to employ the individuals named in the applications. There is a traffic in that class of business in people from non-preferred countries, which, in my judgment, is not legitimate and ought to be held in check.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. We want that specific. A traffic by whom?—A. As I have already suggested it is in competition by the steamship lines.

Q. That is all right; that is what I wanted.—A. Yes. I know that some of the steamship lines at least—maybe all of them, but at least some—who are associated with us would very much prefer that the business were given up and stopped, because they know it leads to disaster. In other words, we get too many people of this class who have no definite destination.

Now, the people whom we—the Canadian National Railway—bring in on our own order from any of these countries, we place. I am not saying in all cases they stay placed on the land because there is amongst them the same human tendency to go elsewhere which exists with other classes but we place them.

Q. That is very important, and I want you to make that statement plain. You say that the steamship companies with which you are associated would be as well pleased if it were stopped—A. I said some of them; I do not know about all of them.

Q. That is a very important statement?—A. I considered the importance of it before I made it. I realize it is important. I think that would simplify some of the serious difficulties of the Department of Immigration, as well as being a good thing for the Dominion of Canada, if it were handled in that way. That, in my judgment, is the source of most of the trouble. The competition is very keen. Men go out and solicit signatures to applications. That is going on all the time, and we all know it. The individuals who are soliciting usually get from somewhere a sum of money for getting the signatures to the applications, because the passages are valuable. That is the basis of this business which, in my judgment, should be held in check.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Would you suggest putting on a board in this country?—A. No. If this arrangement were effective, as I have suggested, the Department of Immigration could hold the two railway organizations directly responsible under the railways agreement. We are supposed to be responsible at the present time for this very business about which I am telling you, and that is the reason I bring it up, because it is one of the features which we, as the Colonization Department of the Canadian National Railways, find it very difficult to control, and, therefore, I would like to see it stopped. If under the Railways' Agreement we bring more people to this country than can be absorbed we are exposed at once to public view, and we should be prepared to take responsibility if they cannot be assimilated.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Would you read that recommendation again?—A. (Reading). "As affecting Continental immigration of single men from non-preferred countries and in order to avoid congestion and consequent unemployment in Canada, it is recommended:—

"(a) That the nomination system for people from non-preferred countries be confined to the following degrees: father or mother, husband or wife, son or daughter, brother or sister, uncle or aunt, of an individual now engaged in farming in Canada."

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. Or prospective wife—sweetheart? You must include that?—A. You are on thin ice now, sir, although I think you are right.

Mr. SPOTTON: The hon. minister is a skilful skater.

The WITNESS: In addition to that I also suggest—

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Mr. Black, that would mean in effect that no one could come from the continental countries unless they are of the agricultural class and have relatives in Canada?—A. No, it does not mean that, Mr. Stewart. It means that this traffic that is carried on by steamship lines in soliciting would be stopped, but it would not prevent the colonization departments of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways saying how many people they themselves could actually place, and it would mean that all the people brought in would be brought in to definite destinations.

Q. That does not conflict with the operations of the railway companies?—A. No. The next is the suggestion in connection with licensing—

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. That would mean that no one could come from these countries unless they had relatives in this country?—A. Oh, yes; we would bring them ourselves and know exactly where we were putting them. In other words, we are in the colonization business. The steamship lines can hardly be expected to have the same interest in building up the interior of Canada that the railways have.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. But the people which the steamship companies are bringing out are being brought out under the railways agreement.—A. I know that. That is what I said a moment ago. They are coming under the railways agreement and that is a phase we cannot control as we would like to, and we want you to help us.

Q. And the railways are responsible for the people they bring. I want to make that point clear.—A. I know that quite well Mr. Forke, but you know I recommended to you last Fall that this business be discontinued and that you assist us to live within the terms of the railway agreement to this extent.

Q. Yes, I know that, but you are responsible for the people you are bringing out. Have you any way of knowing the people for whom you are directly responsible, and the people the steamship companies bring out?—A. Yes, we have.

Q. Then why not refuse to bring them out?—A. That is just the difficulty sir. The system is just this—

Q. I know the system all right?—A. You say to us, "Do not pass any application along, under the railway agreement, which the steamship company

(Dr. W. J. Black.)

distributes", but if we say we will not take them, somebody else will, and the only way it can be regulated is to stop that kind of thing altogether. It is not stopping or preventing the supplying of what is a real need in this country, because there is a legitimate way of supplying it, and we want that assistance, so as to be able to live within the terms of an agreement which we consider is sound.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Mr. Black, I want to know if I have this clear in my own mind. You would suggest that permits only be issued to relatives, outside of the activities of the Department itself and the two railway companies?—A. Yes.

Q. I see now?—A. That is it. That, gentlemen, is the outline. It includes practically everything I desired to say to you by way of recommendations.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. I would like to ask you whether, from your knowledge of the existing sentiments in the agricultural districts of the three prairie provinces, there is any strong desire to have a larger extension of agricultural settlement in those provinces at the present time.—A. It is difficult to answer that question Mr. Cahan, by any general statement without explanation, because the conditions vary very much in different agricultural districts and in different parts of the country. Of agricultural districts there are some in which public sentiment is opposed to bringing in more people for settlement. There are other places again where sentiment is very markedly in favour of immigration and there are all degrees in between. It varies a great deal. My own conclusion is that taking the country in general the sentiment in favour of settling more people on the land represents the major sentiment, that is, there are more people in favour of immigration than there are against it.

Q. Can you give us any of the underlying conditions which induce a different sentiment in one locality from that which exists in another, one being favourable to increased agricultural settlement, and the other either against it or indifferent?—A. No. I cannot give you a satisfactory answer to that. It varies very much. A community assumes an attitude toward a public question which is very different from the attitude assumed by another community similarly situated. It is very hard to account for the reason why one community looks at it another way.

In the West there is sometimes sentiment expressed by British people against too many people from continental countries coming as they fear there will be developed a competition which is not to their own interests. Generally speaking, the opposition to new settlement is due to the belief that increased production means lowering the market value of or the demand for farm products.

Q. Would it not be fair to state that in the older agricultural communities a feeling exists against a larger immigration of agricultural or farm labour, while in the newer and less developed districts the sentiment is not as hostile?—A. No, it would not be correct to assume that, because I would say there is a stronger feeling against immigration in some parts of Western Canada, than in the province of Ontario.

Q. I was dealing solely with the west?—A. Oh, yes, our towns and cities, and our urban people, are practically all in favour of more immigration in Western Canada.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Is it not a fact that the big drive for immigration comes from the urban centres, such as Montreal?—A. No, I would not say that. In judging that, you

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

have to take the expressions you find in the public press of the country all over Canada. I am inclined to think that the press of Canada, as a whole, has been favourable to increased immigration.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. There is no other question I would like to ask regarding the nominations. In our agreement with the railway companies, it is specifically stated that no one who has any connection with a steamship company, shall solicit immigrants and that the railway company will employ men for that purpose who are on a stated salary, getting no commission, and who have no connection with the shipping agencies?—A. I have not a copy of that agreement here, but the reference in the agreement wherein we obligate ourselves to employ a specific type of agents, applies only to the Certificate Issuing Officers whom we employ in Europe for the examination of these individuals. They examine the steamship applicants, just the same as the settlers we ask for. I do not recall that there is anything in the agreement affecting those who go forth in Canada to get the men to sign the application.

Q. That he shall not be connected with the shipping agencies, and will be entirely separate from the shipping agencies?—A. I did not know that it was there.

Mr. EGAN: In the railway's agreement, the railways are responsible for these nominations.

The WITNESS: Yes, I know that, but do you say that we are tied up so that no one can solicit these applications?

Mr. EGAN: Not on this side, but you are responsible for the nominations.

The WITNESS: That is what I said before. That is why I make this recommendation, because I want the agencies to be able to live up to it.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. You want to be able to live up to your responsibilities?—A. That is right.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Is it not true that in the agricultural districts the agitation is to get the immigrant who has some money, rather than the poorer class that are not able to provide farms, or anything like that?—A. Every district in Canada is willing to see men come in who have enough money to buy farms that are already going concerns.

Q. And if we have to finance them, and put them out on the land, there is not much desire to have that class?—A. There is not much public sentiment to support that kind of thing.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Throughout the whole Dominion?—A. Generally, as far as farm people are concerned.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. They want the people to come in who have a little money?—A. Yes, and there is great difficulty to get people with money from the British Isles. It is very hard to find people with money who will settle on the land.

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I will just read that clause in connection with the nominations:—

“That cash nominated and prepaid applications for the admission of single men and men not accompanied by their families, shall be restricted to nominations and applications by persons actually engaged in farming in Canada who desire to bring relatives or others to join them and be employed on the land. As a further safeguard to the transaction of this business, it will be necessary to use the nomination and affidavit forms annexed hereto.”

The WITNESS: That is quite right. That means that the applications shall be restricted to persons engaged in farming. You can go out and get these applications signed by many men engaged in farming, but my idea is to confine it to the relatives only of those who are farmers.

By Mr. Cahlan:

Q. From your knowledge of the Australian system, can you tell us whether the immigration into Australia is under the control and direction of a national commission, or whether it is under the control of a department? I understood that in Australia the whole matter was under the control and direction of a national commission on immigration, or internal development, I do not know just what name?—A. I cannot give you as definite information on that as I should like. Something has been done in regard to a national commission. I do know that the respective states of Australia are insisting upon the control of all aspects in which they have a financial interest. One of the difficulties in connection with Australian immigration, has been because the different state governments have had their agreements, usually with the Overseas Settlement Committee at London. There have been a number of such agreements.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. As a matter of fact, the states insist on controlling the population? A. That is practically it.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Can you tell the Committee the amount of money your company is spending on immigration and colonization?—A. In answering that question, as to the amount expended on immigration, I am sorry that it is impossible to give you the exact amount that we have spent on immigration alone. I can give you the amount that was spent by our department in 1927. As I explained at the beginning, we have really three departments operating under one heading, Colonization, Agriculture, and Natural Resources. The total expenditure in 1927, under these three headings, was \$560,000. Of course, the major part of that would be for colonization.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Do you spend more money in the United Kingdom than on the Continent?—A. It costs about four times as much to get immigrants from the British Isles as it does from anywhere else.

Q. Have you larger agencies in the United Kingdom than you have on the Continent?—A. Yes. We cover the United Kingdom more fully. In fact, the only other places where we have regular agencies are Norway, where we have one, one in Sweden, one in Denmark, and one in Holland. You will understand that where we have only one agency in each of these countries we could not cover the countries very fully. In the British Isles we have quite a large organization, spread all over the country.

[Dr. W. J. Black.]

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. What is your thought, at the present time, as to the prospect of increasing the number of permanent immigrants from the United States to Canada?—

A. For the last five years we have been anxious to believe that the next year would show a considerable increase in the number of residents of the United States, or farmers, who would come to Canada to settle. The increase has not materialized as we expected, and the hope for the immediate future is not as great as we would like it to be. Just what effect the change in the industrial conditions in the United States may have is hard to say. It looks as though there may be a slight increase this year over last year, but it is not as encouraging as we would like, and the prospect for the immediate future is not as bright as we had expected.

Q. There is a slight increase over last year?—A. It looks as though there will be an increase over last year, but it will not be very great.

Q. It will not be a flood?—A. No. We are conducting a very active canvass in the central Western States, which are the agricultural states, for settlers for Canada. Of course, as I said to you before, that is a land purchase proposition. The American, who comes to Canada to settle, comes to buy a piece of land. He settles down at once, and if you did not know he was a new-comer you would not know but that he had been there for some time. He is farming in just the same way, and generally entering into the life of the country, just the same as our own people.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Would you summarize generally the activities that are so much greater in Great Britain than on the Continent? How is it that those activities are so much greater?—A. The chief reason is because in these other countries there is a higher percentage of agricultural people who are anxious to migrate, and there is a higher percentage of people who are easy to settle on the land in this country.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. And there are men with money that would like to come from those countries?—A. Some of them with a good deal of money. We can get more people with money from some of the Continental countries than we can from the British Isles, and they are willing to settle on the land.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Is that largely the reason why it costs so much more?—A. That is the chief reason, I would say.

Q. When you say it costs more, do you mean per capita?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. When you were before the Committee last time you gave the percentage of agriculturalists in Great Britain; what was that percentage?—A. It was under five per cent.

Witness retired.

Discussion followed.

The Committee adjourned until Tuesday, April 17, at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, April 19, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we will now come to order.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Chairman, before we commence our proceedings this morning, there is a small matter to which I would like to call the attention of Mr. Egan, the Deputy Minister, whom I understand is here. At the conclusion of a former meeting I asked him for certain information regarding the number of immigrants brought out and placed through the efforts of the Department. I think he supplied that information. I also asked him for the number brought out to be specially engaged in special work, for some years back. I do not notice that that is on the records. Mr. Egan promised to give it to me, but perhaps he has not had time to secure it.

Mr. EGAN: It has been in for some time.

The CHAIRMAN: The clerk informs me that it is now in the printer's hands.

Mr. GLEN: Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the wish of the Committee at the last meeting the Chairman nominated a sub-committee to consider communications received from different organizations and individuals who wished to attend before this Committee. We went through the communications, and found that a large number of them were from individuals. We have left them in abeyance for the present, and we will not trouble you with those now. There are, however, a number of organizations which we thought should be asked to attend and give evidence. The Committee was composed of Messrs. Cahan, Edwards (Frontenac), Garland (Bow River), Hon. Mr. Ralston and myself. The organizations which we decided to ask to attend are the Anglican Synod, the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League, the British Welcome and Welfare League, and the Salvation Army.

I move, Mr. Chairman, seconded by Mr. Cahan, that representatives from these organizations be asked to appear before this Committee at one of our meetings. I would also ask, at the same time, for permission from the Committee authorizing the sub-committee to again meet, because there are some further communications we have received since we met, and which have not been taken into consideration, and we should consider further those which we are now holding in abeyance.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, you have heard the motion—

Hon. Mr. STEWART: What is the British Empire League?

Mr. GLEN: The Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Have they an organization doing general immigration work?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think I can answer that question. The British Empire Service League in the province of Alberta has undertaken through a sub-committee to make an extensive study of this problem. They have the responsibility for calling the attention of the Department to the overflow of central European immigrants into Alberta last spring. Their allegation is that the same conditions exist in an even more aggravated form this

year, and they have made applications formally to this committee to be heard in the matter. Your sub-committee, as Mr. Glen has announced, thinks it is fitting that we should hear the representatives of the Legion.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to listen to anybody who can throw any light on the subject, but if this is an organization localized in one province, it will cost us considerable money—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The request has come from the central Legion situated at Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Garland has made a statement that is news to me, that they have made representations. I am not aware of any information that has come to the Department of Immigration. Does my Deputy know of any?

Mr. EGAN: No sir.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: It appears that no information—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: It is all right to say "carried" and "carried." My hon. friends seem to be in a dreadful hurry. All I want is information, and I am going to get it before I agree to carry anything. This Committee has rather important work to do, and if we are going to sit here listening to every organization, whether interested in immigration or not, we will keep on sitting here without securing any report. I am perfectly willing to listen to anybody who can throw any light on this question, but I want to know what particular interest this organization has. If it is a soldier organization interested in immigration, if it comes from a central organization, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the sub-committee met and it represented all shades of opinion in this Committee. You would be surprised at the number of applications brought before us and how modest we have been, but we thought an organization such as this which is making a protest throughout the length and breadth of this country, and which asked through its headquarters to be allowed to send its representative to express their views, could not very well be turned down without giving the impression that this Committee was trying to prevent evidence coming before it which might be useful. Therefore, our recommendation was that one representative of this organization be allowed to come and give evidence before us. I think it is a fair suggestion made by the sub-committee, and I am prepared to stand by it.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: As far as I am concerned, I withdraw my objection. I regret I "buted in" on what the sub-committee has decided upon but we have requests made from all quarters, to come and give evidence. Apparently it is a pleasant task to travel a couple of thousand miles to give evidence before the Committee, and I wanted to know what they knew about it. If they have any information of value, we ought to have it.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Mr. Chairman, just one word: No doubt this organization has made a very exhaustive inquiry into the whole situation. They have made a report well worth reading. I have read it carefully, and while I do not agree with some of their conclusions I think that their evidence will be of value to the Committee.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): That is precisely what we are after. The Minister may have made up his mind from what he has read regarding the activities of this organization, and I hope he will allow us to make up our minds. There is no doubt but what there is a difference of opinion; and there is more than one person differing from the Minister in opinion, and it is our purpose to resolve those opinions. I would like to say to the Minister of the Interior that the sub-committee had before it a great many requests and we

used the best judgment God gave us to weed out those, and reduce the number which we would call. If that is not satisfactory the only alternative is to appoint another Committee and allow us to retire.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): My only submission is this: If we had a representative from the whole organization it would seem to me to be much more proper than to simply have a representative from one branch. Apparently they have not submitted this for the approval of the other branch as even in the province of Alberta. I would like to think that the Legion itself was behind this whole thing, as a Legion. I think if we issue an invitation we should issue it to the Legion in Canada rather than to any particular branch, whether it comes from Calgary or Edmonton or any other point.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, you have heard the motion. Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt it?

(Motion agreed to).

The CHAIRMAN: At our last meeting it was decided to ask Sir Henry Thornton, Sir Joseph Flavelle, and Mr. Beatty to appear before this Committee. We are glad to have Sir Henry Thornton with us this morning. Sir Joseph Flavelle is in California, but will be back next week, and Mr. Beatty will be here on Wednesday next, April 25. We will be glad to hear from Sir Henry Thornton now.

Sir HENRY THORNTON, K.B.E., called.

The CHAIRMAN: Sir Henry, this Committee on Agriculture and Colonization is studying the question of immigration to this country, and is seeking information. We have asked you to appear before us to give us the benefit of your advice. We will now be very glad to hear from you.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: What I have to say of my own volition with respect to the question of immigration will be rather shortly and simply told. This is apart from any question of a specific nature which might be addressed to me by members of the Committee.

Dr. Black, who is in charge of the administration of our immigration and colonization departments, has given evidence before this Committee and has made certain statements which, generally speaking, might be regarded as dealing with the details of the proposition which confronts all of us. I am entirely in accord with all of the statements which he has made.

If I may presume, I should like to have the privilege this morning of dealing with the question from perhaps a broader point of view than that with which it has already been dealt.

Now, we all admit that one of the essentials to the achievement of the ultimate destiny of the Dominion is the introduction to our country of immigrants who are sound in mind and body, and especially those who are prepared to dwell in tranquillity under our social scheme and under our system of government, providing those who come to the country, after having fulfilled mental and physical qualifications, can find useful employment and become self-supporting, which is to say that we do not wish to bring to this country those who after arrival will become public charges or objects of charity or require assistance in the working out of their economic destiny.

Within those limits and with those reservations, I take it there can be no question but that the larger number of people we can bring into the country the more the country will prosper and, therefore, our problem becomes this—having regard for the reservations which I have just stated—what scheme can be developed which will accomplish that objective?

We have to-day the two larger railway companies in Canada who are actively engaged in the immigration and colonization business, and which are

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

striving to their utmost to bring into the country useful settlers. We have in addition to the two railway companies, a number of excellent organizations which are striving to achieve the same end. That work is being carried on with a good deal of competition and with a good deal of duplication. It seems to me that two things are essential to the full development of a sound immigration policy, that is, a policy which will produce the maximum results. First, we must, I think, spend more money on immigration in the future than has been spent in the past. Immigration is like anything else; it has to be financed. It cannot be accomplished without the expenditure of money.

Secondly, it seems to me—and I am looking at it now from quite a national point of view, or at least trying to look at it from the national point of view—that the thing which is lacking to-day is co-ordination of effort. Each one of the instrumentalities, including the government, which is pursuing the immigration question, is doing the best it can within its limitations, but my feeling is that the immigration question is a national question. It is not a political question; it is not a sectional question, except in so far as each section of the country would naturally strive for and wish to secure its fair proportion of immigrants, but the whole question of immigration is so bound up in the welfare of the country itself that it rises, or should rise, far above the plane of sectionalism or politics or religion. It is a movement which affects vitally all of the people of Canada.

Now, as I pointed out a moment ago, all of those who are interested in immigration are doing their best within their limitations. Certainly, from my knowledge of the activities of the two larger transportation companies, namely, the Canadian Pacific Railway and ourselves, I feel that we are doing as much as we can and to the best of our ability, but I think our immigration problem would be materially less difficult and would more nearly approach a solution if the government—and when I use the word "government" I am not speaking of the government in a political sense; I am speaking of the instrumentality which, under our laws, governs this country, and which may be one kind of a government to-day and another kind of a government to-morrow, and I am speaking of the government in connection with its administrative functions—as I say, I think the situation would be considerably improved if the government, and, under it, the Department of Immigration, co-ordinated entirely and had control of the efforts of all who are to-day ardently striving to accomplish certain objectives. In any movement of this sort I think the best results come from centralized leadership. I do not think it is the kind of thing you can turn loose a number of organizations upon, no matter how sincere they may be, nor how ardent they may be in their efforts. If that be done, inevitably competition develops and in the pursuit of competition there is always a repetition of work. We get in each other's way. Therefore, my feeling is that the whole of our immigration movement ought to be led, consolidated, and brought into co-operation by the Department of Immigration, and in that Department I think it ought to be looked upon as a great national question, a question which merits the very best effort that can be brought to bear.

Speaking for the Canadian National Railways, I will say that we will be happy to accept such leadership. We might conceivably lose a little here or gain a little somewhere else, but so far as the Canadian National Railways are concerned, we are interested in seeing to it that at the end of the year the maximum number of people who can be usefully employed are brought into the country, and while we have a certain pride in settling our own lands and in promoting settlement along our own railways, every immigrant who comes to Canada, no matter where he is located or not matter who brings him in, will indirectly prove of advantage to the Canadian National Railways. So that I should, in the last analysis, look at it from the larger point of view of not so

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

much trying to compete with others who are in the same occupation, but in trying to lend an effort to assist the accomplishment of the maximum results, as a whole.

I do not see that any instrumentality can so successfully or satisfactorily impart that leadership to the movement as the government. It is a national question, as I have said. It is not a question which can be successfully administered for the whole of the Dominion by any other instrumentality than the government.

If I might make a recommendation, I should say that the government should be empowered with such authority as will permit it to give that leadership, but at the same time I think steps should be taken to provide the expenditure of a larger sum on this proposition than has been spent in the past.

With respect to the expenditure of money, you will probably ask "How should that money be expended?" Well, of course, there is propaganda abroad; there is advertisement; there is making known to prospective immigrants the opportunities which Canada affords. There is, secondly, assistance in bringing these immigrants to Canada. Thirdly, there is a field—which I think is a useful field—in the provision of partly prepared or entirely prepared facilities for prospective agricultural immigrants.

For example, in the United States—in certain parts of the West of that country—there are a large number of farmers who are experienced, hard-working and industrious people. For many years they have been only one or two jumps ahead of the sheriff. They have to do the best they can with the situation which confronts them. They will not come to Canada and go through the toil and—in some cases—the distress of clearing land, living perhaps in an unsatisfactory habitation until such time as they can get on their feet and provide themselves and their families with suitable houses, and if those farmers were offered a prepared or semi-prepared farm, my opinion is that a fair number of them at least would come to Canada. They are experienced farmers and men who would become self-supporting forthwith.

That is merely one indication of the way in which funds might be expended to bring to Canada a desirable agricultural population.

The number of immigrants which come to this country must necessarily be limited by our powers of absorption, and by "powers of absorption" I mean the number of individuals who can find useful, self-supporting occupation in this country. Our powers of absorption to-day are represented by a certain number, and in the last analysis we must fix the number of people who can be usefully brought to the country. But we might, very likely, increase our powers of absorption quite legitimately by the expenditure of more money.

That, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, is briefly the only contribution which I can make at the moment, which I hope may be constructive; first, a greater degree of co-operation, in fact complete co-operation between all these instrumentalities which are now engaged in promoting immigration; secondly, the expenditure of larger sums, but only to the extent that those sums will provide a larger degree of absorption.

I think that is all I can say, but I will be happy to answer any question any member of the committee may wish to ask, if I can.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Sir Henry, in your opinion what nationalities and from what various countries are most adaptable to our needs in establishing men on the land, and in getting agricultural immigrants properly established? How would you classify the countries from which you would obtain such immigrants from the standpoint of their adaptability for such work.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I think the answer to that is pretty obvious. Naturally—and quite rightly—we would prefer to bring to this country a maximum number of people from the British Isles, those who speak our own

Sir Henry Thornton.]

language, who are citizens of the same commonwealth of British nations, who, more or less, have that psychology which is similar to our own. I think preference should be given so far as possible to bringing English-speaking people—those whom I would describe as having our psychology—to Canada first.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Would I be right in saying to you, Sir Henry, something along this line: the British settlers first, those from the United States second, the Scandinavian countries third, and then the other parts of continental Europe? Would that be in accord with your view?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: That is roughly it. Along with the Scandinavian countries, I would include the Dutch, who are a fine, sturdy people.

Mr. DONNELLY: And the Belgians?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: And the Belgians, who are particularly thrifty individuals. Also the Frenchmen if you can get them, but there are not very many of them—very, very few. Then there are the Swiss who are also useful citizens. Also the Germans—if we will forget for a moment the feeling of the late war—because whatever we may or may not think of German psychology the German is a good, hard-working citizen. Then the Czecho-Slovakians, who are more or less German in a way. The Northern Italian is a good citizen also. I would say that probably represents in a general way what one would call “preferred continental countries.”

Mr. DONNELLY: Sir Henry, in regard to those immigrants which we get from the United States: is it not a fact that most of them are Europeans?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I do not think so. Perhaps Dr. Black could answer that question.

Dr. BLACK: Quite a large percentage of them are of Scandinavian extraction.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I cannot answer that question myself offhand. May I make this statement? In bringing what I shall call “foreigners” to this country—and a witty ambassador once said that “all the world is divided into three classes, Americans, Englishmen and foreigners”—so speaking of foreigners in that sense, when you bring foreigners into this country I do not believe it is possible to make a good Canadian out of the first foreigner who comes here. If he arrives here at the age of thirty, or something of that sort, his psychology is pretty well fixed, and while he would make a useful citizen, he is not really going to be a Canadian and I do not see how you will ever make a Canadian out of him. My notion is to play for the second generation, and those become just as much Canadians as the families who may have lived in this country for some generations. They forget their native language; they probably do not ever speak it; they become absorbed in our population, and I think it is a waste of time to spend too much effort on catching the old man and the old woman. But get the children, and you will keep them automatically.

Mr. CAHAN: Just one or two questions, Sir Henry. I read with interest your address at Toronto on February 13, and I presume that the reference you there made to increased freight rates for the railways in Canada, under which your Board of Directors will contribute for immigration purposes \$10,000,000 a year and take the whole job off the people of Canada as far as financing was concerned, was purely facetious.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I can only say that it was not entirely facetious. What I meant, and the picture I wished to paint, and the point I tried to bring home was this: that we would be justified in Canada in spending more money on immigration than we are now spending, and that money has to come from somewhere. It occurred to me that one way to drive that point home and to paint that picture was that if there was a tax levied—to call it such—through an

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

increase in freight rates it would pretty accurately and justly distribute the burden and provide a fund which could be used for the purpose named.

Mr. CAHAN: But it would be more evenly distributed if it came from the Dominion treasury in the ordinary course?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: That is probably true, Mr. Cahan.

Mr. CAHAN: I do not wish to discuss it, but I want to know under what conditions your statement was made with regard to the statements you made then and have made to-day in connection with the co-ordination of effort: that must be very seriously considered by this Committee, but I would like to direct your attention to this, that in Australia I understand that co-ordination of effort is obtained through a national commission which is independent, to a certain extent, of the Department of Immigration and is independent of government, occupying nearly the same position relative to immigration in Australia as, for instance, the Canadian National Railways, as an instrument of government, is related to the Dominion government of Canada. Now, in your opinion, could not this co-ordination of effort be better obtained through the organization of a national commission dealing with it and having full powers, of course under government regulation and government direction and government control, to deal with this matter, rather than that the workings of immigration should be laid to a mere department which is often surrounded with a great deal of red tape from the fact that it is limited in power and does not come in contact with all the elements of society throughout the length and breadth of the country? Would you give us your view of a national commission formed for that purpose?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: One of the functions of government is the administration of national affairs. Presumably the national government is in the best position, because of its legislative authority, to administer national affairs and it would make small difference to those of us who are interested in the problem of immigration, how it is accomplished, provided there is some central body armed with sufficient authority to take charge of the movement in the larger sense.

Any national committee or body which might be set up could presumably do the work quite as satisfactorily as the government providing it has the support of the government, but it would be quite useless I think for any national organization such as that to which you refer to satisfactorily administer this immigration problem unless they had full governmental support and full governmental authority. The two come to the same thing in the last analysis. I take it that perhaps what one would say is that this is a question of such importance that it ought to be placed in the hands of an independent commission which would be above suspicion—if one can use such a term—with respect to politics, with respect to religion, and with respect to sections of the country.

Mr. MCGIBBON: Would not such a commission have to have on it representatives of the provinces, of the railways, of labour, agriculture and the financial organizations of the country?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: Well, there would be, I take it, an immediate request on the part of provinces, religious bodies and others, to have proper representation on that committee. I do not myself believe much in committee work. Disraeli once said that the "best committee was a committee of three, one of whom was ill all of the time, and one who attended no meetings whatever."

If such a committee as has been suggested were not too big and were not too cumbersome, it would undoubtedly get satisfactory results, but the moment you get to the committee proposition then at once there is a demand for all sorts of representation on that committee, and each representative on that committee necessarily strives to promote the particular thing in which he is interested.

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

Mr. CAHAN: Your suggestion is that a commission if appointed should be a small body, which would co-operate for the one general objective.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I should say, Mr. Cahan, that the smaller committee and the more power it has, the more successful the result.

Mr. CAHAN: I believe in one-man government myself. (Laughter.) Now, I would like to ask you one other question, just to follow this a little further. That commission or that body which had charge of immigration in the sense you have outlined, would have to take into consideration, would it not, first, the question of land settlement as one department of its work, and, secondly, you have suggested the creation of more employment in the country for the purpose of giving employment to those who do come in, apart from the question of land settlement. Have you any suggestion to make other than those made by Dr. Black—to which we have listened with a great deal of attention—with regard to land settlement, and, secondly, have you any definite idea as to the work of such a commission in the development of employment generally in the country for the purpose of giving employment to our own people and to those who may be brought in?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I do not think I can add anything to what Dr. Black has already said in detail in that respect, Mr. Cahan. I do, however, feel that such an instrumentality, whether it be a commission or whether it be a department of the government with enlarged powers year by year, would unquestionably find greater opportunity for employment as the years went on. Naturally when they got face to face with their problems, and in touch with them, there would appear avenues which may be unsuspected by any of us to-day which would create the opportunity for bringing useful immigrants to Canada. The whole thing I am trying to make clear is a centralized, strong, capable control of this whole situation, with all the rest of us who are now working somewhat at cross-purposes as the servants of that organization, and that organization would be like the man in the Bible, he would say to one "Go," and he goeth, and to another "Come" and he cometh. We would all do the best we could to work loyally together in supporting one central organization to assist in carrying out such duties as may be assigned to us.

Mr. CAHAN: I notice in connection with the Australian system in regard to land settlement, which is land development, that they have also what we might call another department, making a complete investigation of the opportunities throughout the length and breadth of the various states of Australia, and the commission which deals with it also has the power to deal not only with investigation of the possibilities of employment, but the creation, as it were, of new sources or possibilities of employment.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: That is to say, they give attention to increasing the absorption power of the country?

Mr. CAHAN: Quite so.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: That certainly is one of the functions which ought to be carefully developed.

Mr. CAHAN: I remember when the Canadian Pacific Railway first reached the Pacific about 1885 hearing the late Sir William Van Horne discuss with other business men the possibility of giving a greatly increased business to that railway, and he went on to show how between Montreal and the Pacific he had found various opportunities for the creation of industrial employment throughout the length and breadth of the railway, and subsequently to bring in settlers and bring in incomes for the railway in connection with agricultural development. I would like to know if you have any views with regard to that—and you must have—in regard to the development of the Canadian National lines

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

developing employment along your own line, and as to what opportunities there are in this country for the creation of employment in other than the agricultural industry.

SIR HENRY THORNTON: Well, we have in Canada in addition to our own great agricultural potentiality, which one may describe as representing Canada's meal ticket, because it is the largest single industry, a very great asset which in generations to come will prove of untold advantage to the country, and I refer now to our cheap water-power, or cheap energy which exists in Canada as the result of harnessing our water powers.

One of the things which any manufacturer looks to and must look to is a cheap source of energy. We have that in abundance in Canada and I visualize the day—perhaps in the next generation—when eastern Canada will take advantage of that cheap water-power and will become a very, very great manufacturing district. That is a thing which necessarily must develop somewhat slowly. Capital must be attracted to the country for the construction of manufacturing plants, and we are seeing the beginning of that to-day. We see in the Lake St. John district, north of Quebec, an enterprise which is capitalized at several million dollars, which has deliberately come to Canada and invested a very large sum because of the advantageous shipping conditions, because of a good labour supply, and especially because of a large quantity of cheap water-power. That is one thing which has happened, and I am referring now to the location of the International Aluminum plant at Arvida. That is one indication of what will happen in eastern Canada with greater numbers and with greater opportunities in the future.

Mr. CAHAN: Naturally, but Sir Henry, may I direct your attention to one other aspect of it? I am no expert, but I go from one end of this country to the other almost as much as anybody else, excepting railroad men or men who have more business activities than I at the present time, but I would like your opinion dealing with the Canadian National Railways about this feature. Take the great mineral belts which we find from the Atlantic to the Pacific, which are vast possibilities as for employment in the future for both capital and men. Is the Canadian National Railway, through any of its departments, making an effective effort to make known to the world at large the particular opportunities for mineral development which rise from time to time, and placing that before the investing public to the extent necessary to bring in capital and to create employment? In other words, to use your own expression—which I commend—are we selling Canadian opportunities to the world to-day in an effective and efficient manner?

SIR HENRY THORNTON: So far as our efforts are concerned, Mr. Cahan, we are sparing nothing to accomplish the objective you have mentioned. We have an industrial department which is administered by a competent officer of the company who has his representatives throughout the length of the Canadian National railway and who is addressing his entire time and attention to attracting new industries to Canada and to, as far as possible, assisting in the extension of existing industries. The success of that is evidenced by the fact that, as mentioned in our annual report—and I am speaking now from memory—somewhat more than four hundred new industries were located on lines of the Canadian National railway last year, with a capital expenditure of rather more than \$40,000,000. This is an indication that the field in which we are working is a fertile one and is in the direction you have pointed out.

In addition to that we have our Department of Resource Development which is making an intensive study of the industrial opportunity in all sections of the country, and especially in the district to which you refer—this mineral area—In the latter part of the year before last we published a pamphlet explaining the opportunities for mineral development and mineral exploration in

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

Canada, and that pamphlet was given a wide circulation and was very favourably commented upon. (To Dr. Black): Do you happen to have a copy of that pamphlet with you?

Dr. BLACK: No, Sir Henry.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: Perhaps you would be good enough to send one to Mr. Cahan so he can see what is being done.

Mr. CAHAN: I would suggest that one be sent to each member of the Committee.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: Yes, send one to each member of the Committee.

Dr. BLACK: Very well, sir.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: It was a very exhaustive treatise on the mineral condition of Canada and drew a great deal of favourable comment. I may say also that we have resource engineers at some of our agencies in the United States, who are available to prospective investors and who seek prospective investors and endeavour to give them information with regard to the opportunities in Canada.

Mr. CAHAN: Sir Henry, my point is this. I know something of your efforts in that respect, and I have some knowledge of what is being done by the Canadian Pacific. We all know that the Ontario government is making efforts in that direction, and also the British Columbia government. In line with the policy of co-ordinated efforts toward one efficient end, is it not practically possible, in your view, for a national commission—I will call it that for want of a better name—to co-ordinate all those efforts of the C.P.R., the Canadian National Railways, the respective provincial governments, and so forth, so that all my work in accord with one single commission or one single head for the purpose of securing the general industrial development of the country along the line you suggested? Would it not be better if the Canadian National Railway were in co-operation with the central organization, and through it in co-operation with the Canadian Pacific and with the provincial governments and other institutions of a like character to carry out a concerted plan for the development of the internal resources of Canada and to give employment to our own people and to the people we bring in from abroad.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: That is carrying the functions of a commission to which you refer rather farther than immigration. The question is where to draw the line. Whether it be a department of the government or whether it be a national commission, the objective is to bring to Canada the maximum number of useful immigrants, and the only way to increase the number of useful immigrants is to provide employment for them in the way you state, but that may carry you very, very far afield. It might conceivably absorb the present Department of Immigration, the Department of Trade and Commerce, and perhaps even other departments. Now, that is a very large question and it is going a long, long way afield. In its bigger sense that is a question I would not like to answer offhand, Mr. Cahan.

Mr. CAHAN: Well, Sir Henry, I understand it is a large question but we all have been impressed during the last few weeks with the breadth and importance of this question of immigration. It is not merely a question of land settlement, but in its broader aspect it means giving employment to people. But along the line of your recent discussion—take the one in Toronto which I have before me, which was a very, very important suggestion correlating the efforts of all instruments of government to the private endeavours toward one end: now, is it not possible to have a commission, or department—call it what you like—that will co-ordinate the efforts of the Canadian National Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and all these other instruments to secure the development

(Sir Henry Thornton.)

of the internal, natural resources of this country, not only water-powers but minerals and mining and forestry and all the rest, so that we would create employment in this country which would bring people here without bonuses to any great extent, but bring them here by giving them a fair standard of living and ample employment for their labour, after they are brought in.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: You have stated, Mr. Cahan, a sound academic proposition, but I am doubtful as to whether it could be carried out with practical success to the extent you have stated. I think it would be preferable that this commission, or the enlarged powers of the Department of Immigration, or whatever it may be, should focus its efforts, first, on a simple immigration proposition. When I say "simple" I mean the single immigration proposition.

Mr. CAHAN: For land settlement only?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: For land settlement only. Now, after measurable progress has been made in that direction, and the commission, or whatever it may be, has found its feet, and knows more about the situation, then there might well be considered an expansion of its powers, an expansion of its activities. But I am just a little doubtful—in fact, I am considerably doubtful—about giving this commission so much to do that it can not accomplish anything. I would rather see it concentrate—if I may put it—on an immediate problem rather than to undertake the whole of the economic development of the country, which is a very big and serious proposition.

Mr. CAHAN: Not exactly the whole economic—

Sir HENRY THORNTON: When I say that, I mean whatever you had in your mind.

Mr. CAHAN: Sir Henry, let me put this to you—and I think I am stating it clearly. As an outsider I came into this discussion, not only in the committee but outside of it, amongst the members of Parliament, and I put this to you on the part of a considerable number of the representatives from the prairie provinces in this House. There is a feeling that land settlement must be very slow in development, and there is a very widespread feeling in the three Prairie Provinces that no unusual effort should be made to develop those districts agriculturally more rapidly than they are being developed at the present time. Have you met with that feeling?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I cannot say that I have exactly met with that, but I have heard it said that the land settlement should be limited lest we get too many farms and get to much acreage under cultivation and raise so much as to break the price of the things produced. But I think the extent of the world absorption of our agricultural products is such that we need not be worried about that particular problem. I think we can market all of the agricultural products we can produce in Canada at remunerative prices.

Mr. CAHAN: One more question, Sir Henry, and I am done. Would you give us your opinion with respect to the question of land settlement as suggested by the two gentlemen, one representing your immigration department of the Canadian National Railways, and the other representing the Canadian Pacific Railway immigration department, with regard to providing a fund to assist in settling immigrants so as to give them homes at a moderate cost, and place them upon the land so that they may from the start do something in the way of agricultural work which will bring in a revenue sufficient to maintain them?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: In reply to that question I can only say that I heartily endorse all that Dr. Black has said in the evidence he has given before this Committee.

Mr. DONNELLY: You said that in the Western part of the United States there were a great body of farmers who were just one jump ahead of the sheriff.

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I think so.

Mr. DONNELLY: Have we not in Western Canada, and in fact throughout the Dominion, a great body of men who are just one jump ahead of the sheriff?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I do not think so. If they are, they are jumping with considerable success. I would say this: I think our farming population in Western Canada, and in fact the whole of western Canada, is in a thoroughly prosperous condition. I think as a class our farmers are considerably more contented and more happy than the American farmers.

Mr. DONNELLY: I think that is true—

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I do not think there is any section of any country which is on so sound a basis and so full of fine energy and desire as that part of Canada west of the Great Lakes.

I will give you one little example of that. Last year when I went through Western Canada I stopped at a number of towns and I was impressed with what may seem a very trivial thing to some people, but to me appeared to be a big thing. I was impressed with the number of nice homes—not houses, but homes—which had been built in nearly all of the western cities—

* Mr. VALLANCE: In the cities?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: In the cities and towns. These were homes evidently built by the men who were going to live in them. There were flowers in the gardens; the lawns were well kept; the homes—as I called them—carried with them evidence of contentment and evidence of prosperity. They were not rich people who lived in these homes, they were sound, well-to-do, contented people.

Now, as you go through the country and look at the farms and the buildings all through Western Canada there seemed to me to be what I would describe as an unostentatious aspect of tranquility. It did not take the form of automobiles or frivolities and enjoyment of things of that sort, but it took the form of sound, honest stuff.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Have you inquired in your travels in western Canada how many of these homes, as you call them, were occupied by the builders?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: They were either occupied by those who built them or those who built them under some kind of agreement, I should say, from what I saw.

Mr. DONNELLY: Have you been very far away from the railway? Have you driven through the country?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: A fair distance. I have not wandered very far from the right-of-way.

Mr. CAHAN: You have been in the maritime provinces and have heard the discussion there about so many young men and young women going over to the United States, because it is a short trip, and cost but little, and they go into the United States for settling. In our own province of Quebec we have had a great number of people go across the border to settle in the neighbouring republic. What is your view with regard to giving advantages in the way of lower freight rates, and advantages in respect to settlement, to the people in the older communities of the east who are looking for, what shall I say, adventure?—giving them similar opportunities at low rates to settle in the west as are given to the people of the continental countries who are brought in? What about giving the same opportunities to the people of the east to settle in the west?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: A far as the maritimes are concerned, I look to the day—and no distant day—when the situation of the maritimes is going to be

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

very much better economically than it is to-day. I think there are agricultural opportunities in the maritimes which can be developed. Consider, for example, the raising of sheep. If there is any country well adapted for the sheep industry it is the maritime provinces, and at one time I am told that there was a considerable industry of that sort. The tragedy of it all—as well as the joke of it all—is I understand that the sheep industry was abandoned because the dogs killed the sheep. It would seem to me that a simple solution of that would be to kill the dogs. There certainly is a field for sheep raising, and for the sheep industry in the maritime provinces.

I think there is also an opportunity for a further and wider development of the fishing industry in the maritimes. If I lived in the maritimes to-day I doubt very much if I would feel disposed to follow the example of those who have left that section of the Dominion in the past. I would stay right there, because I think the day is near at hand when there is going to be a larger, better and bigger development in the maritimes than has been seen for some time. So why offer people facilities to leave a good thing?

Mr. CAHAN: It has seem to me—and I am laying the groundwork for my own opinion—as I travelled through the northwest that the men who give solidity and stability to the prairie provinces, and the northwestern districts, are largely those who have come in from the maritime provinces, to a certain extent from Quebec and probably more largely from Ontario. Is it not better to encourage an immigration of that kind into the northwest in order that the sentiment of the east—and when I say “east” I include Ontario—may have an educative influence as well as providing an incentive for the development of that country?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I doubt if we have—

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): If I understand that remark correctly, I would like to say that I happen to be an eastern man myself, coming from about as far east as I could, and it was certainly no intention of mine to go west to educate the westerner. Since I have gone to western Canada I have learned a great deal.

Mr. CAHAN: I am not discussing that, but what I say is that if you go through the northwest you do find—at least so it seems to me—wherever you find a foreign settlement, with a small nucleus in that settlement who come from Ontario or from Quebec or from the west, that they do exert an influence, which I call educative, upon the political and economic life.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: They are like the Scotch—

Mr. CAHAN: Could not something be done in the way of giving transportation facilities on a more advantageous basis to those in the east who desire to settle in the west?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I would say that the presence of any maritimer in any community would be automatically regarded as an asset, but I do not think we have reached the point where we would be justified in offering opportunities for the depopulation of any particular section. What I mean is this, Mr. Cahan: if the opportunities in the west are sufficiently attractive people will go there without assistance in the way of reduced rates to those who live in other parts of the Dominion. It will automatically take care of itself.

Mr. LUCAS: Dose that apply to Canada as a Whole—

Sir HENRY THORNTON: There is a good deal in that—

Mr. LUCAS: If that applies to Canada as a whole why spend money to bring these people in? Why not spend it to improve conditions in Canada and then the people will come here automatically?

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

Sir HENRY THORNTON: There is a good deal in that theory, because after all, why have so many immigrants gone to the United States and gone to such an extent that they are now trying to keep them out instead of letting them in? Probably it is because of the extraordinary economic development which has taken place in the United States in the last twenty-five years.

Mr. MILLAR: You spoke about unemployment being at the root of the trouble in connection with immigration. I think one of the roots of our trouble is the seasonal unemployment. Take the west after the harvesting is done, and there are 30,000 or 40,000 men turned loose; the industries will not take them because they want help for all the year round. Is there any adjustment possible whereby employment might be created to take care of this slack seasonal unemployment?

Mr. ROWE: It seems to me that is largely due to the lack of mixed farming. As mixed farming development improves and progresses in the western districts the seasonal unemployment will be diminished to a great extent in Ontario. We hire all our farm help for twelve months.

Mr. DONNELLY: Sir Henry, do you not think that the cause of emigration from Canada to the United States is the bringing in of more people than we can find work for here?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I do not think that I can say that, but I think everybody will admit there is no good bringing more people into this country than can find useful employment. Anything else than that is silly—

Mr. MILLAR: May I now have an answer to my question?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I am sorry, but would you mind telling me again what your question was.

Mr. MILLAR: About seasonal unemployment.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: That is a new proposition to me. I do not know that I can answer that offhand. Dr. Black, how much seasonal unemployment do you think there is, from your knowledge?

Dr. BLACK: We have had no difficulty whatever finding winter employment for all the people we brought out for summer work. We have not had in our prairie offices a single individual applying for winter employment, whom we were not able to place.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: The question was broader than that; it related to the whole of Canada, quite irrespective of whether we may or may not be fulfilling our responsibilities. I do not know offhand to just what extent this seasonal unemployment exists. Frankly Mr. Millar, I cannot answer that question.

Mr. MILLAR: I take it from Dr. Black that there was no proof of unemployment in the winter season as a result of men being turned loose after the harvest.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: What Dr. Black had in mind was that we are responsible for all the immigrants we bring into Canada, and we feel we are responsible for their useful occupation. His statement is that so far as our responsibility as a railway is concerned, we had no trouble, but your question goes farther than the Canadian National.

Mr. MILLAR: I was not confining it to the railway at all. I was putting the broad question. It is useless to deny that there are thousands who flock into the towns who have absolutely nothing to do. I have a number in mind now. We see them every winter. The question is, what should be done with them? I think probably that is why there are a number of them drift to the States; it is not a question of more pay, but there are no jobs in Canada.

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

Sir HENRY THORNTON: That is something I would have to study more at length than I am permitted in the few minutes we have here to-day. However, I think that is something that ought to be carefully considered.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Following up the question asked a moment ago to the effect that to Dr. Black's knowledge there was no single person whom the Canadian National Railways brought to Canada whom they might have placed during the winter months, I would like to ask if you can tell us at what type of jobs they were put, and about what their wages are.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I personally cannot answer that. May I ask Dr. Black to answer that?

Dr. BLACK: I wish, first of all, to change the shade of meaning of a phrase which Mr. Garland has expressed. He said "who might have been placed." I do not wish to give the impression that we "placed them" or "might have placed them." I make the emphatic statement that we placed everyone we brought out last year, who came to us afterwards for replacement. They were put in jobs at various occupations, largely in bush work and lumber in other parts of Canada and to some extent in Alberta and Saskatchewan farther north than where they had been working during the summer months. It was very largely in bush work at the prevailing rate of wages.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): There is a point there that is a little ambiguous. Dr. Black says that anyone who applied to the Immigration Department of the railway for a replacement was able to be replaced. Was it not the case that in so doing they put other men out of jobs, and placed these men at lower wages, which probably the original holder would not accept? On the face of it, at that particular season, the wages which he was asking he could well earn in comparison with the man who replaced him, and yet to reduce the wages was it not often the case that the replacement was made, and that the unemployment was not decreased? There is a delicate point right there, and I happen to know a good deal about some of the replacement work, and I believe I am stating a fact here concerning a thing which has taken place to a large extent in Western Canada. Many men here from Western Canada know this to be a fact.

Dr. BLACK: If anyone will tell me of a case where that has occurred in connection with our activities, I shall certainly be glad to hear of it, or perhaps I should say, sorry to hear of it. I have never heard of a case as far as our organization is concerned, although I have heard that such things went on. Moreover, we would not permit that to be done if we knew of it, and our officers have all been instructed not to attempt to place any man in another man's job.

I wish to make this observation, while we are on this question. This is a phase which has not been touched upon. I refer to the question of seasonal unemployment. In my judgment we have to be reasonable in the consideration of this question, and recognize that because of climatic conditions in Canada, there always will be a certain amount of what we call "seasonal unemployment." The fact is if we are not going to bring to Canada any more workers than can be employed in the winter time what in the world will we do with the work which has to be done in the summer time? The same applies to the question of increasing number of men required for harvesting. If we are not going to have any more men in Canada than are required in June and July to engage in agriculture where will we get our supply for handling the farmers' crops in August and September? As a matter of fact, just last fall in a good many districts in Western Canada there were not nearly enough men to meet the demands made by the farmers. The help was not available. We have to look at this question in a broad way and realize that under the conditions exist-

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

ing in Canada at the present time, and which always will exist, so far as climate is concerned, there will be a certain amount of seasonable unemployment. However, the people coming here are informed of that condition.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: That is a condition you find in other countries, more or less; the less the better, of course.

Mr. GLEN: Sir Henry, it has been stated in a great many publications that there has been discrimination shown against British settlers coming into Canada. What is your point of view with regard to the expenditures by your railway for obtaining immigrants in the old country as against the continent of Europe, and also have you any view with regard to the medical inspection, and as to whether anything can be done to facilitate British settlers coming to Canada?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: As far as our expenditures are concerned, we spend that amount of money which will bring to us the maximum number of settlers from the British Isles. The amount of money we spend is limited entirely by what we get from it. That is, we spend rather more than we think we should in order to incite as much immigration from the British Isles as possible.

Now, so far as your other question in regard to medical inspection is concerned: I understand that has been discussed here before. (To Dr. Black) Did you give any testimony in that respect?

Dr. BLACK: Yes, Sir Henry.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: All I can say is that the details have been studied by Dr. Black and whatever he said, I say.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I would like if possible to have the benefit of your opinion a little more in detail regarding the suggestion which you made a little earlier. I understood you to say that there was a very desirable class of settlers brought here from the British Isles and elsewhere, or would be brought here if something were done to provide a home, or a house with some acres of land and some stock. I presume that would have to be done in co-operation with the provinces, since the provinces own the land. Take Ontario, for instance: would you think that could be worked out by the provincial government giving a certain amount to establish or build houses, with certain additions in the way of stock and equipment, supplemented by a grant for such effort on the part of the provincial government, supplemented farther by a substantial grant from the Dominion government and perhaps co-operation from the old country.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: When I made that statement it was referring more particularly to the attraction of experienced farmers from the United States to Canada. I did not have in mind particularly the immigrants from the British Isles, but whether it be that or whether they come from the United States, if the province owns the land, of course you have to work in co-operation with the province. My thought was that there are a certain number of experienced farmers—and I had in mind more particularly those from the United States—who if they could get rid of their holdings in the States and could come up here and get a farm with, what we might call, the rough edges knocked off of it—

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): You mean an improved farm?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: Partly improved, at least. They would be glad to come up here. It is a considerable thing for a farmer of, we will say forty-five, with a couple or more of young children and a wife, to come up to Canada and tackle a piece of land which has to be cleared, living perhaps in a log cabin for a year or so with his family until he can get a suitable house built. It is bucking nature, so to speak.

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

Mr. DONNELLY: Would these men buy these farms?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: They would not come up unless they did buy them. You would have to sell them to them on terms.

Mr. DONNELLY: In western Canada there are lots of men who have taken farms in that way.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I don't care where he comes from. Get him in the town—all the better. If we get him in western Canada, we will do all we can for him.

Mr. DONNELLY: Often the men in our little towns and villages in Western Canada will go out and take farms of that character.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: That is the thing to do.

Mr. ROWE: Has there been any careful survey taken to place any approximate estimate on the amount of land available in that western territory, that would be appropriate for successful colonization? Could the amount of land, available at this particular time as being ready for immediate and successful colonization, be estimated? Is it not a fact that a great deal of the land that is sometimes reckoned on, and estimated on, is not really appropriate and suitable for immediate and successful colonization?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: We could give you a sufficiently close estimate of about how much land there is, but it cannot be given at this moment. We can probably tell you about what that is, with sufficient accuracy. It is known, but I do not just happen to have the figures with me, or I cannot remember them off hand.

Mr. ROWE: Is the estimate that you have in mind near enough, in your own mind, and it is approximately less than the general estimation?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: We could give you our estimate of that a little later, but we cannot do it at this moment. If you would like to have it supplied, we can tell you what we think it is.

Mr. COOTE: Referring to the statement which you made a little while ago, regarding our ability to sell all our agricultural products, which we can produce in Canada, at proper prices, might I ask if you have any information in regard to that? That is, have you made a study of the question, you or your officers, and is any information which you might give to the Committee a substantial statement?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: Let me put it a little differently, but it will mean the same thing. I do not think that it would be possible, practically, for us to bring into Canada a sufficient number of agricultural producers to affect the price of the crop to the farmer. In other words, the number of people that we are bringing into Canada, in its relationship to the cost of production, is not a factor in my judgment.

Mr. DONNELLY: How far away from a railway do you think it would be wise to ask settlers to go and settle?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: How far from a railway?

Mr. DONNELLY: Yes, to grow wheat?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: In the Peace River country we have farmers who are apparently making a living, and who are hauling their production anywhere from forty to seventy-five miles. Do not understand for a moment that I advocate that, but you are asking me what the economical distance is that a farm could be located from a railway.

Mr. DONNELLY: Do you think it is wise to settle them any farther than about fifteen miles, at the most? Can a man make a go of it when he is more than fifteen miles from a railway?

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

Sir HENRY THORNTON: Fifteen miles is probably not very far wrong; perhaps you might spring it to twenty miles. But it certainly is a heart breaking thing. I remember the first time I was in Canada, when I was in one of the western cities. I went to dinner at a club in the evening, and about nine o'clock they brought in a human iceberg. He was a farmer with a beard and a mustache, and the icicles were hanging from his beard, and snow was all over his coat. They said to me, "look at this chap, he is one of our hardy western farmers. He has hauled his wheat in about thirty miles." He looked more like an iceberg than anything I have ever seen in my life. From that time onward I have been impressed with the problem of moving farm produce from the farm to the railway. It is a heartbreaking job.

Mr. DONNELLY: As a matter of fact, I know you cannot work a farm more than fifteen miles from a railroad, and have any success. When you estimate the amount of land in western Canada that is opened for farming, I think you should take into account that it should not be farther than fifteen miles from a railway.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: Of course, that situation is being corrected as rapidly as both the C. P. R. and ourselves can correct it, by building branch lines each year.

Mr. CAMPBELL: You seem to take the existence of fine residences in the city to mean prosperity on the farm?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: Not fine residences.

Mr. CAMPBELL: What opportunity have you for studying economic conditions on the farm, and actual financial conditions?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I do not know much about farming, although I lived on a farm as a boy and know something about it. I can only answer your question in this way: I think our farming population in western Canada is contented—as contented as any farming population ever becomes—that they are reasonably happy, and that they are doing reasonably well. They certainly are a lot better off than the farmer on the other side of the border.

Mr. CAMPBELL: That might not mean very much.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: There is no use in trying to make out that farming is an occupation de luxe; it is not. It is very hard work, and you cannot get anything else out of it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I was leading up to another question. I think you will admit that there is a very direct relation between the amount of farm produce that is produced—grain, butter, and all that kind of thing—and the price?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: Oh, yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL: And no one will deny the fact that a very large proportion of the agricultural population on the prairies is not getting ahead financially to-day. A great majority of the farms are mortgaged. If you produce considerably more of these products, you are certainly going to lower the price. If the argument that you use there would apply to the agricultural industry, why would it not apply to the manufacturing industry, and everything else? Bring in more manufacturers, and develop those industries?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: Of course, you can theoretically establish a production in Canada which would break the price of anything. But my statement is that that is not a danger, because we are not going to bring people into Canada in sufficient numbers to break prices. As the production increases, so will the demand be increased throughout the world. There is a constantly increasing demand, for all kinds of agricultural products. Our problem is simply to see—and I think there is no danger in it—that we do not produce faster than the demand.

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

Mr. CAMPBELL: If we do produce any faster, then you will have another great influx of people away from the farms, such as we had a few years ago. It is also true that those who are in mixed farming, as well as grain farming, are not obtaining any great return to-day.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: Is your theory that there should be no more land opened for cultivation in western Canada; that we should stop right now, and not do anything more?

Mr. CAMPBELL: My idea is to leave things alone, and let the economic forces bring about the development, and not force them. Or, if you are going to force that situation, then force the manufacturing and other industries.

Mr. DONNELLY: You say that there are not as many farmers in Western Canada who are just a jump ahead of the sheriff, as there are in the United States? For the last twenty years I have been going over the prairies, and I must say that that has not been my experience. There are a great many people that are just one jump ahead of the sheriff.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Some of them are a jump behind.

Mr. MILLAR: What importance do you place on this aspect of the question; that of keeping a balance as between British immigration and that from Continental Europe? Do you place any great importance on that?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I think it is important to bring in as many British immigrants as we possibly can. They ought to be given the preference, and we ought to exhaust that field before we think of other fields.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): A moment ago you stated that your Colonization Department were exhausting the British supply to the best of your ability?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: We are pressing to get every immigrant from the British Isles that we can.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And, apparently, it has not been successful so far, in properly balancing the flow from the other portions of the world. In the event of that situation continuing, and I presume you have in mind that it is likely to continue, is there much use in continuing the enormous efforts that are now being made in Europe?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I do not know that I quite get exactly what you mean. This country has a power of absorptions; it will absorb usefully a certain number of immigrants each year. We are trying, and I think all activities are trying, to exhaust that power of absorption as largely as possible from the British Isles. If there are other opportunities for absorption, other than those that can be filled from the British Isles, we are filling them from Continental countries.

Mr. ROWE: A few minutes ago you said that you noticed a vast improvement in the urban centres of Western Canada, in the towns and cities. There was an apparent higher standard of living, and also an apparent expansion. I would like to ask you if you figure that that expansion, and improved standard of living and prosperity, has been marked in the same agricultural areas adjacent to these places, or has it been merely an urban advancement?

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I cannot convince myself, from what I have known of Canada in the last five years, that the economic position in the west has deteriorated, or gone backward. I think, broadly speaking, that the situation in Western Canada is better to-day than it was five years ago. I look with the utmost hope upon Western Canada's development, and I cannot see anything that would particularly excite alarm.

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

HON. MR. FORKE: I have listened to the questions that have been asked, and I think they have been trying to get from you the ratio that you think Continentals should bear to British immigration. I do not think you have given us any information on that, as yet?

SIR HENRY THORNTON: Well, I do not know that any formula has ever been established.

HON. MR. FORKE: I am not asking you to give us a formula, but you expressed the thought that we should get all the British immigrants that we possibly could?

SIR HENRY THORNTON: Yes.

HON. MR. FORKE: We are all agreed upon that, and there is no difference of opinion anywhere, but there is some difference of opinion as to the ratio the Continental should bear to British immigration. It is very important to get an opinion on that from outside sources.

SIR HENRY THORNTON: I have never studied that particular formula, Mr. Forke, and I do not know that anybody has.

HON. MR. FORKE: In the Immigration Department we are continually up against that, as to how we shall get British immigration, say, on a fifty-fifty basis, as compared with Continentals.

SIR HENRY THORNTON: You mean to say that we should establish the theory that we will only bring in one Continental for every Britisher, so to speak?

HON. MR. FORKE: Something like that.

SIR HENRY THORNTON: For one and a half? I do not know, as I have never studied that particular problem.

MR. COOTE: The matter of the standard of living was mentioned here a minute ago. I would like to ask you whether, in your opinion, the standard of living of the farmer should be equal to that of other workers, such as, for instance, the employees of the Canadian National Railway?

SIR HENRY THORNTON: Obviously, there is only one answer to that. The farmer certainly should not be expected to accept a lower standard of living than that which generally applies to those who are similarly placed in other occupations.

MR. COOTE: If that standard obtained, do you think it would be necessary for you to suggest that we should have farms partly prepared to hand out to the settlers whom we are trying to induce to come to Canada? Should it be necessary, if we had that standard among our farmers, to offer the farmers, whom we are trying to get to come to Canada from other countries, ready-made farms, so to speak?

SIR HENRY THORNTON: Farming is like any other enterprise, it has got to start in a small way. How far the farmer progresses, and what his standard of living is going to be, depends a good deal on his own industry, his own ability, and on the general conditions that surround the farm. It is like a man that starts a factory. He starts in a small way, and the factory grows. What his standard of living ultimately becomes depends on what the fruits of his industry and his ability may be.

MR. COOTE: If the fruits of our industry were satisfactory at the present time, I feel that we could have plenty of farmers coming in. I just wanted your opinion on that point.

MR. DONNELLY: Do you not think that the assisted passage to the English settlers coming into this country is the cause of dissatisfaction with our immigration policy? If a man wanted to come out here as a farmer, and he applies for a cheap passage, and says he is a farmer, the Immigration Department may

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

investigate his statement and find that he is not, and they turn him down. He then goes out to the country and says. "they do not want immigrants in Canada at all." That is the cause of a lot of dissatisfaction in England with the immigration policy.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: What is your experience, in that respect, Dr. Black?

Dr. BLACK: I am not sure that I got the question.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: A prospective immigrant presents himself as an agricultural labourer, a farmer, or one familiar with agricultural pursuits, and asks for assisted passage on that theory; it is found that he is not an experienced agriculturist, and he is refused, and he throws up his hands and says, "nobody wants immigrants in Canada." Have we had any trouble in that respect?

Mr. DONNELLY: Is that not the cause of the dissatisfaction with our immigration policy here in Canada?

Dr. BLACK: That is a minor cause. That kind of thing is, to some extent, responsible, where people are being refused as not being properly qualified.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: If a man said he was going to enter farming work?

Dr. BLACK: That was the plan that prevailed last year, Mr. Forke, and we had no difficulty. There was no incentive, as a matter of fact, for the individual insisting on describing himself as an experienced man, because, if he were a capable inexperienced man, and expressed a desire to go farming, he came forward just the same as if he were experienced. I am not prepared to say that it is the same this year as it was last year. Last year the Department displayed some confidence in us, in the matter of selecting these people; this year it has not.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: We are trying to co-ordinate the different efforts.

Sir HENRY THORNTON: I do not want anything that I have said to be construed as criticism of any instrumentality which is now engaged in furthering immigration. I think that all of those who have that objective in mind are doing the best that they can, under the circumstances that confront them, and under their limitations. I was only hopeful, in the suggestions I made, to remove, if possible, some of those limitations. I do not want it to be thought, from anything I have said, that I am unappreciative of the hardships which confront our farming population. I lived on a farm as a boy, and I have milked cows, pitched wheat, and one a good many things, and I know what farm life is. Nobody can make it out to be anything else than pretty hard toil. There is no way that you can remove the rigors of toil from farm life. On the other hand, it carries with it a certain independence. I sometimes think, as President and Chairman of this company, that I would gladly trade places with a farmer if I might enjoy his independence of thought and action. I do appreciate that one of the great problems that confront our farm population in the west is the hardship of hauling wheat, and produce, a number of miles to a railroad. It certainly is a heartbreaking task. As I survey the whole of our situation in Canada, with respect to agricultural pursuits, if you eliminate the toil and hardship which is inherent to farming occupations, I think that our position is better to-day than it was five years ago. I think it is better than it is in the United States, and I think our efforts should be addressed, as has been stated at this Committee meeting this morning, towards making farming just as attractive as we can to the farmer. The more attractive it becomes the less propaganda we will have to put out, and the more automatically we will bring farmers to the country.

[Sir Henry Thornton.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, April 25, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: We have the pleasure of having Mr. Beatty, the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with us this morning, and I will now ask him to give us his advice. Mr. Beatty, we have been investigating the question of immigration in this country and as the head of one of the large railway companies in this country we thought you might have some valuable advice which you would be willing to give to us. We shall be glad to hear from you.

Mr. E. W. BEATTY: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: I thought perhaps it would be better as a matter of convenience to you that I should reduce to a comparatively short memorandum a summary of the views which I hold on this very important question. The reason why I selected that method was because of necessity I can only deal with it in a general way. You have already heard the testimony and the experience of representatives of the department and of the colonization departments of the railways and others, men who are very familiar with the actual working out of the regulations and statute with respect to immigration and I hope that their views have been and will be—because they are not all as yet called perhaps—of some value to the Committee.

"We are all, I think, impressed with the fact that Canada has made substantial progress in the last few years, but we think that progress can be expedited and even greater prosperity follow the admission of more people to this country. I share the views of the President of the National Railways and I agree with others that our ambition should be to admit, first from Great Britain, for very obvious reasons, and afterwards from the United States and selected continental countries, men who are physically fit and able and willing to follow agricultural pursuits. If the figures for the past three years are approximately correct that 80,000 per year was the net increase in our population other than from natural increase, and the extent of the country and its resources are considered, it cannot, I think, be said that we are admitting an adequate number of new settlers."

I will add by way of explanation that this figure is a compilation made by the officers of our colonization department based upon the necessary demands in the countries. The most accurate estimate which could be obtained of those who left Canada for the United States, and adding to that the Canadians in the United States for more than six months who have returned to Canada.

I feel too that in the present condition of things, the fundamental principles underlying the legislation are correct and that immigration as applied to Canada relates almost exclusively to land settlement and colonization. The entrance of men who follow other pursuits will depend upon the opportunities for employment existing in Canada and when these opportunities are known to exist men will be secured without difficulty and without any effort, in fact, the history of the United States has indicated that where jobs are available applicants are usually found for them in great numbers. If I am correct in assuming that the question is one of land settlement and colonization, our efforts must be of necessity largely restricted to obtaining settlers or those who can in time become farmers. We have a great deal of unoccupied land in Canada. Of the exact acreage in each of the Provinces I am, of course, unaware and I do not know of any survey or surveys which have been generally made which

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

would indicate the actual figures. Some years ago—about the year 1922—a survey was made by an experienced officer of Canadian Pacific of lands fairly fit for settlement within fifteen miles of existing railways in the three Prairie Provinces, and I think the estimate was 34,000,000 acres approximately. Now in that area there were inevitably some Crown Lands, railway lands and many acres that were privately held. There would, too, be some bush land and, because uncleared, it would not be available for immediate settlement. There might, too, be a distinct difference in the character of the lands, some being less fertile than others, and it could not therefore be said definitely that all offered the same opportunity for successful cultivation. There has undoubtedly been a change in the last five or six years and these figures would probably not represent the exact situation to-day but they do indicate that we have not reached the point when restriction of immigration of agriculturists or those intending to be agriculturists should be imposed. If these assumptions on my part are correct, and if the country can support more than nine million and one-half people and increasing prosperity will follow increased population, not only in the general wealth of the country through extension of its agricultural activities but through the increased markets thereby provided to its manufacturing and other industries, it seems fairly obvious that immigration policies should be vigorously prosecuted.

We are still an agricultural country and the area under cultivation is increasing every year. The demand for the products of the farm in definite and, so far as I can see, is not likely to be lessened by the world's requirements.

I understand the members of the Committee are considering whether we are making sufficient progress and bringing in enough men and if we are not, why are we not. I think it can be generally accepted that, so far as the activities of the transportation companies are concerned, the question has ceased to be one of the land selling, but rather one of colonization, and what that means generally in the development of the country in which they must of necessity be large participants. Both Railway Companies have extensive organizations, as you have learned, and the annual expense to them in the conduct of their operations is very great. With the organizations of the Government and of the two companies and other institutions who are maintaining separate immigration activities, one would naturally expect very satisfactory results, but the results are not entirely adequate as indicated by the figures I have mentioned.

Several causes are suggested as the reason for the slow movement, particularly from Great Britain, and, of course, I am not able to suggest what the actual causes are. I do think, however, that the experience of this year should indicate with reasonable accuracy what improvements, if any, are required in our overseas organization and where the difficulties lie.

Obviously, questions of immigration must always be the concern of the National Government. The question is a national one and should be as free as possible from political complications. It has been suggested that the Government should co-ordinate the operations of the different immigration organizations, but so long as the Government is itself directly responsible for immigration policies and the carrying out of them, it would be very wise to make use of these organizations who have many contacts and grounds of appeal which are not open to exclusive Government agencies. The railway companies are, of course, the largest organizations interested in immigration. They have their representatives in practically all countries where immigrants are available and they have very extensive organizations in Great Britain. They have been, and I think will continue to be, a very strong factor in immigration, and a very great help to the Government in executing its own policies. The Government organization is of necessity one consisting of a minister and his deputies and their representatives throughout the world. Can this organization or system be improved so that the work will be done more effectively? That is a matter

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

of opinion, but my own view, without intending to criticize the organization we have set up over a great many years, would be that perhaps more executive efficiency and greater administrative latitude would be secured by a form of organization modelled a little more closely on those of our great corporations in order that authority should be vested in one or more commissioners, men of experience in executive work and who would command substantial salaries. I make this suggestion because immigration is an enterprise, to use the words of Sir Joseph Flavelle, "whose raw products in human material is associated with a great adventure. It is not things which are being dealt with but men, women and children who are embarking upon an enterprise in which no one can definitely forecast who will be the winners and who the losers." These elements require patient, constructive effort in order that the country should be filled with contented and prosperous people. The Government can give great leadership in this enterprise by establishing an organization as nearly perfect as possible without in any degree removing the responsibility and the authority of the minister and of Parliament.

The larger policies involved in the selling of Canada and its advantages to the people of other countries, the inter-relations with the provinces and the immigration agencies are matters which I think could be more effectively dealt with by the creation of a new office and not be imposed upon the departmental officials, already burdened with the enormous duties of administration under the statute and the regulations. I admit that the latter gentlemen are just as anxious for Canada's advancement as we could be but they are only human and cannot accomplish the impossible in view of the tremendous volume of work which inevitably falls upon their shoulders.

The work of the provinces is important because each province should know its own resources, in lands and otherwise, and make provision for their being known elsewhere. I would suggest that where no sufficient surveys exist the provinces, in conjunction with the Dominion, should have it done in order that the magnitude of the available agricultural opportunities of Canada should be definitely known.

I am in favour of extending the principle of training in Great Britain in order that the number of misfits should be lessened as much as possible, and I think it only fair that the cost of such training should be borne in part by the Federal Government.

I have read the evidence given by Doctor Black and Mr. Macalister, and while they proceed upon different lines, they both advocate a system of small holdings, with moderate assistance to families who intend to acquire land but who in the interim require work in order to support themselves. The recommendations of these two experienced men might, I think, in many respects be reconciled to the common purpose which they have in mind.

In view of the necessity of establishing families only partially educated in agriculture, I understand the Government have under consideration a scheme for the construction of cottages, with Government assistance. I think this is a step in the right direction and the results should be satisfactory.

I have seen Mr. Macalister's statement relative to the special efforts being made to induce immigration from the British Isles. This policy has been followed over a great many years by the Canadian Pacific for the reason that we naturally prefer as many people of our own race to settle in Canada as are suitable and possible to be obtained. These efforts have been unremitting over a period of years and the expense of the conduct of these operations has been very great. The difficulties, as explained by Mr. Macalister, undoubtedly exist and the number of those available for farm pursuits from Great Britain is of necessity much less than from the Continent because there is no surplus farming population to draw from and those who do come must require some preliminary training.

A rough estimate of the proportion of different nationals in Canada indicates that almost eight million out of a population of approximately nine and a half million are of English, Scotch, Irish or French origin. This would indicate that we have not yet reached the point at which the admission of Continentals should cause apprehension.

The question of the country's development and the exploitation of its natural resources is indirectly with immigration as the greater the development the greater the opportunity. It has, of course, for its initial purpose the attraction of capital to Canada for development purposes but each successful step which is taken in that direction means added opportunity and therefore greater population. The Company with which I am associated has maintained an extensive Development and Industrial Branch. It employs experts in geology, metallurgy and mining, apart altogether from the work in farm development and experimentation which has gone on in Western Canada for a long time. The object of the Development Branch is to bring to the attention of those likely to be interested and to give technical advice and accurate information on subjects relating to Canada's mineral and other resources. Its publications are numerous and spread in many countries and it is looked upon now I think as a reliable source of information respecting the possibilities in this country, industrial and other.

In addition, through the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, in which the Railway Company has a large interest actual mineral explorations are continuously conducted in many parts of Canada from the far east, in Newfoundland, and west as far as Vancouver Island. The amount of money spent annually by the Consolidated Company by itself and in conjunction with others, in the development of new properties, is probably as great, if not greater than any other Canadian agency.

From that memorandum, gentlemen, you will appreciate that I have not attempted to suggest anything very drastic. The four or five submissions I have made to you were made with the idea and on the assumption, of course, that the land in western Canada, being fertile land to the extent we know about, being unproductive, we have a duty to see that it is made productive and the only way we can do it is to put men upon it. We have not erred, I think, in free immigration into Canada; we have been careful; we have made it as selective as possible and we have proceeded on the assumption for several years past that if we have more people, and assist them in cultivating these lands, the prosperity of Canada will be increased. Unless that assumption is right, we have all been wrong. Personally I have always thought it was right. It is an asset to this country to have these lands; they have proved their worth, and I think it is our duty to see that they are cultivated by the right kind of people, which, of course, does not mean the indiscriminate admission of all classes of people into Canada. I have always had this feeling—although I have nothing to base it upon at the moment—that in the next few years our principal source of farm immigration will be the United States. I do not think they will come to Canada because they failed in the United States, but I think they will come because we offer greater opportunities for successful farming operations than do the places in the United States from which they come. That to my mind, will be the great source of supply for Canada in the next ten years. They will be people perhaps of several different racial origin; they will probably be people mostly from northern Europe, Scandinavians and others of that type, who have been successful in the United States, and on the whole their standard of citizenship has been remarkably good. I do not think we need have any fear from a movement of men of those nationalities into Canada even if they come via the United States after a few years' residence there.

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

I will be very glad, so far as I can, to answer any questions which you gentlemen may care to ask me. This is a very condensed memorandum, but I thought your time was worth something, and it would be better if I were to put my evidence into this form.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. What do you think, Mr. Beatty, of the effectiveness of a system of immigration as we have it now?—A. I think we have not done at all badly. We are facing the problem in a little different way than we did in prior years. My only idea is to strengthen the organization, strengthen the hands of the Minister, and incidentally the hands of the cabinet and of parliament. I like the idea of a one man organization. May be I am a prejudiced witness about that, but it strikes me that if the government recognize the abilities of an outstanding man in a public work of this kind and give him the requisite authority, that he can do a lot for the country and the government itself.

Q. I had more reference to the assisted passages as an effective means of getting more immigration?—A. We must admit, I am afraid now, that assistance in some form is necessary to a great many people. When we had our great influx of immigrants in 1912 and 1913, the present conditions in Great Britain and Europe did not, of course, prevail. The men had the wherewithal to emigrate. They have not yet recovered from the effects of the war, and their individual means are so limited that if they are going to take advantage of the opportunities which we are able to offer them, we will have to help, as will also the British Government.

Q. That will apply to the younger people?—A. Yes, and families will have to come.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. At that time the land was free, and there was a more ready opportunity for settlers of the required nature?—A. Exactly; the same experience as they had in the United States when they had the tremendous acreage of homestead land.

Q. So the conditions to-day are not comparable with 1912 and 1913?—A. No.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. I understand the Canadian Pacific have a colonization scheme in the West. How does your plan work out?—A. You mean in the irrigated districts?

Q. Yes.—A. We sell land on long term contracts with water rentals attached. We assist the settler in his preliminary operations, and particularly do we assist him in education in the use of water, with which all farmers are not familiar. This has met with moderate success, but of course the whole blocks are not as yet disposed of.

Q. You prepared homes for them?—A. In a great many cases.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. You gave your approval to a scheme for the building of cottages for incoming settlers. As I understand it there are three places where these cottages may be built, one, on a corner of the farm, where a two acre plot may be set aside and a cottage built there; secondly, the place where the farmers, judging from what they have been doing, would seem to find the more suitable, in the farmer's own yard where the settler may board the other workers; and thirdly, which did not meet with very much favour the other day, in the small towns, which are not industrial towns; that is, the cottages might be built in the towns where the men's families could live while the men go out into the

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

surrounding districts to work. Which of those three plans would you prefer?—A. I presume that the suggestion made in some such form by Mr. Macalister and Dr. Black was preliminary to the actual settlement on the farms, of these families—upon land of their own. I think they were to be directed into farming operations as soon as possible after their arrival?

Q. But in the meantime until they get this training they were to be placed in cottages?—A. Yes, in cottages but the question you are asking now is which plan I think would be preferable, to have them on the farms or in some towns in the vicinity.

Q. Yes, or by the side of the farmer's own buildings, in his own yard or on some corner of the farm which might be a half a mile or a mile away. Which do you think would be preferable?—A. I think I would prefer to have them on the farms. Not that it makes much difference, providing that the intention of the settler is not voided at all, and he is not deterred from going on to the farms ultimately.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Mr. Beatty, I understood you to suggest that without removing responsibility and authority from the Minister of Immigration and parliament, an organization or a commission might well be formed which should be vested with the general superintendence and direction of the work of immigration, and that this commission should be composed of men of experience in executive work, who should command substantial salaries. Now, inasmuch as that suggestion is along the line of the organization formed by the commonwealth of Australia, it recommends itself to me very much, and I would like to know if you could not elaborate that suggestion a little more in detail.—A. What I had in mind there was, Mr. Cahan, the necessity of the provinces and the federal authorities working in very close co-operation in matters of immigration. I have always felt that the work of the department was enormous under our regulations, because it must be done with great care. I thought if we had a man who was free to deal with the larger questions, as a chief executive of a big corporation would deal with them—subject, of course, to the approval of the Minister and of parliament—that we would get better results. There is work to be done which cannot be taken up now, and under those conditions larger questions to be taken up. Your department would be efficient—let us assume that; that the deputy and the other members know their work and do their work very well; but if you had a man of good business training with some knowledge, as he would have, of immigration problems, put him in that position and pay him, the same as the Canadian Pacific would employ an expert or an executive if they needed one, the same results would be obtained as a large corporation would expect to receive from that form of organization.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. You spoke about selective immigration, and preferring the English to the continental, and then you put the Scandinavians as against the others. You are, of course, aware that rule of that kind was only introduced into the United States after they had a population of 110,000,000.—A. Yes.

Q. Do you think it wise that Canada with a population of 9,000,000 or 9,500,000 should attempt to do the same thing which they are only doing now in the United States?—A. I admit that the United States did not put up the barriers until they had a great many people, and particularly until their homestead lands had been exhausted, but the conditions of immigration after the Civil War—which really started the policy of the United States—were not as they are now. We have a certain absorbing power in Canada. I do not think it has been reached, and I think we would be wise to proceed judiciously. I do not think we should open the doors completely, but I do not see how we can

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

fail to open the doors when our requirements at the moment are for farm population. We must, of necessity, make some selection. Now, the continentals from northern Europe, those who have settled both in the United States and in our country, are selected farmers; they are selected, if you like, because they are put on the preferred list, but we do not offer any obstacle to others coming in—in fact we encourage them, so far as their countries will permit.

Q. Is there not the danger that the Scandinavians and these others will eventually migrate to the United States?—A. Not if they succeed. The United States will always be a magnet, however, as long as it is as big and as strong as it is now.

Q. They now have the two per cent quota basis?—A. Yes, and that has put an additional drain on us. The quota law has increased enormously the drain to the United States from Canada, including our own Canadians which we regret.

Q. There is no quota law in regard to Canadians?—A. No.

Q. What have you to say with regard to that rule on the part of the United States?—A. Of course, that is a matter for the United States, not for me. I think the effect is just as you have stated, that if there had been no quota law in the United States there would not have been as heavy a migration from Canada to the United States.

Q. Even if they put their quota law of two per cent on to Canadians, they would still have enormous numbers from Canada, because of the number of Canadians now in the United States. The quota law is based on the immigration of 1890, so they could take in now about 100,000.—A. I have never figured out what the result would be on us if they applied their law to Canada.

Q. But the effect of the quota law in regard to Europeans is that they are draining Canada of its native population?—A. It is assisting in the process, I think.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. You have had, I understand, in connection with the Canadian Pacific, some experience in land settlement, particularly in those districts in which you have promoted irrigation schemes?—A. Yes.

Q. From your experience in respect to those lands, could you make any suggestion to the Committee as to any effective methods of land settlement, or assisted land settlement to assist those immigrants who come in without money to settle on the land and engage in farming?—A. There is one aspect of that situation, Mr. Cahan, which is sometimes overlooked, and that is the great number of privately owned lands in the West. As I say, in the absence of information which an active survey would give, we cannot very well say the proportion of railway lands, crown lands and privately owned lands which are available for settlement. I would think, however, that the acreage of crown lands available for settlement is less than one would expect. Years ago the "Canada Colonization Company" was formed. It was not under the proper auspices, but the conception behind it was not bad, I have always felt. It was to get all these privately owned lands under one common control for the purpose of sale on easy terms. We are doing that in a smaller way in another way called by the same name, as an adjunct of the Canadian Pacific Railway land settlement operation, and I have always felt that if the government looks with favour upon greater assistance, there must be a method found of bringing in to such a scheme these many, many acres of privately owned land in the three Prairie Provinces, and if the government assists in the settlement of these lands, then the advances made by the government should be prior to any existing charge against that land. No effective scheme has been worked out, because it can only be done by agreement between all of the thousands of owners of

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

private lands who would come in to one great land selling pool. I have never heard that one has been attempted, and it would have to be a part of the government policy, and the government itself perhaps is the only influence sufficiently strong to bring that about. These lands should be made available on terms to which the government itself would agree were fair to the incoming settler. That has never been approached in this country, so far as I know, and I have always thought it was one of our greatest difficulties.

Q. And you would carry it out by specific appropriations to assist settlers to acquire an interest in the land?—A. Yes, in a moderate way, to help him in the first few years, but I would not extend the paternalism so far as to run the risk of causing his own failure.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. What do you consider is the greatest obstacle in the settlement of these lands?—A. The fact that there is nobody in particular in control of them; there is nobody forcing the sale bringing them to the attention of the possible applicant. They are just lying there.

Q. Are they being held for settlement?—A. Some may be held for too high a price under existing conditions. That is more than likely.

Q. Is that the chief obstacle?—A. It would be a great obstacle. I think it is true that a great many of these lands are held for too high a price. Of course, there have been a lot of charges incurred, and the owners may have to take some loss.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Would it not be possible to impose a higher scale of taxation upon lands which are not settled and not developed than upon lands which are settled? I am simply suggesting that. I do not know the facts, as do my western friends, but I know in some other countries where lands are held for purely speculative purposes a system such as I suggested does lead to land settlement, because those who wish to retain the land proceed to carry out the private efforts for its settlement, and those who are not prepared to go on and settle their lands are subject to increased taxation, which makes it less profitable for them to hold the land.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Mr. Beatty, would you mind developing the suggestion made with regard to the employment of an expert?

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. The question asked by Mr. Cahan is one in which I am very much interested and I quite agree with him. I think those who own western farm lands should make every effort to have the land settled, and I would like an answer to Mr. Cahan's question as to whether you do not think it would be advisable to put a higher scale of taxation on unoccupied lands?—A. Before I answer that I would have to know who was to blame for this situation. We do not want to be penalizing the innocent to get the guilty.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Would you mind developing the suggestion made with regard to the employment of an expert who would advise the Minister of Immigration? Would that take the form of a man divested of all responsibility as far as the Minister and parliament are concerned, except, of course, subject to the Minister's approval, or would it be in the form of something like a Deputy Minister of Colonization?—A. My idea would be equivalent to a vice-president of a cor-

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

poration, a man charged with administration under the Minister, of the larger questions of policy in the department, but not to interfere with the details of organization or administration at all, but a man with certain specific functions such as relations with the provinces, and relations with the transportation companies on large questions, because I think you could get them the undivided attention of a man of ability provided he was available through being paid proper compensation, and this would redound very much to the effectiveness of the department's whole work.

Q. Would you, as head of the Canadian Pacific, put your machinery at the disposal of that expert?—A. Yes. I was not suggesting there should be any difference in the close relationship between the department and the railway companies which exists now. This man would be co-operating with the companies every week; he could not help it, from the very nature of his position, and I think the relationship between the companies and the government should become closer rather than more removed.

Q. Would you be prepared to accept the policy as laid down by that deputy minister?—A. Yes. You must give the man authority to function if he is going to be there at all.

Q. And by that you mean the co-operation of each of the provinces for colonization purposes?—A. Yes, I think the provinces have kept out of this long enough.

Q. Would you prefer one or two men?—A. I would prefer one man. Two might not be objectionable. That would be for the government to determine.

Q. The suggestion was made that an advisory board might be appointed upon which would sit representatives from different organizations throughout the country?—A. I think that would be too unwieldy and cumbersome to give any practical results, and I think it would cause the Minister and the government more worry than anything else.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. You spoke of assistance to the incoming settlers. Will you say what nature that assistance should take, and how far it should go?—A. I think it should be moderate assistance. Mr. Macalister, I think, gave the figure of \$1,500.

Mr. MACALISTER: No, I did not mention any figures, Mr. Beatty.

The WITNESS: I think it should be an assistance to provide him with a habitation and the incidentals he requires at the inception of his work; a cow or two and a few chickens and things of that kind, to get him started. There is no use making him think that everything is easy, because farming is hard work, as our pioneers have proved.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. Would you offer any suggestion as to certain credits for, say, five or ten years?—A. The whole thing would be credit. It would be in the way of a loan at a low rate of interest to the settlers.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Would you extend that to the settlers already here? What will you do with them if you wish to avail themselves of these opportunities?—A. That is a pretty difficult question to answer, whether we want to transfer our population from one end of the country to the other.

Q. Then would there not be a tendency to follow out what Mr. Jacobs suggests, that these people be inclined to go across the line?—A. Not necessarily. It all depends on the honesty of a man's purpose when he comes to Canada to farm. If he makes up his mind he wants to farm, even though he

has had very little former experience, our experience has been that a great many of them will succeed, because they are willing to work, are thrifty, and have an honesty of purpose. But a great many men come to this country with mental reservations.

Q. What would you do with the men in western Canada? Would you extend your scheme to them?—A. You mean to extend that principle of assistance to the residents of Canada rather than an inducement to the incoming man? That is a difficult question to determine.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Do you think we should extend to an immigrant the privileges and accommodations we would not extend to the Canadian born?—A. It does not seem fair, Mr. Coote, I will admit. On the face of it, it looks like discrimination against our own.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. Mr. Beatty, since you tell us that so many who have not had agricultural training have made a success on the land, why confine it to domestic purposes?—A. We are doing that for a purpose, because that is the type of men we require; either an agriculturist or a man who can get some preliminary training and become one.

Q. In your memorandum you referred to small holdings. Would you care to give the Committee any approximate idea of the acreage?—A. I was thinking of the small holding in connection with this cottage scheme.

Q. What is your opinion as to an economic unit which can be farmed in western Canada?—A. In acreage?

Q. Yes,—A. I think 160 acres is a good unit; perhaps that is a minimum.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Will you tell the Committee how much land your company has?—A. In the three prairie provinces?

Q. Yes.—A. I have not the annual report with me, but speaking from recollection it is somewhere in the neighbourhood of five million acres of all kinds, accessible and inaccessible, fertile and otherwise. Of course, the best of our land—that nearest to the railway—has been culled over, but a great deal of this acreage we have now is not extra good land, and is a long way off.

Q. Could you tell us something of the policy in selling your own land? How do you sell it?—A. The average price of our dry land sold in 1927 was a little over \$10 per acre.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Of your dry land?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. I presume you endeavour to get what is called the "going price" in each district in which the land is situated?—A. We get what we can.

Q. I have a question here, if I can put it so it will be understandable: is it your chief aim to get all you can out of the land or to get the land under settlement?—A. To get the land under settlement. The land selling is not the big end of our operations, and has not been for some time.

Q. What is the average price at which you are selling land? Is it increasing?—A. No, going down every year.

Q. That is because the choice land—A. Has gone, and these lands are not so good.

Q. You made a statement in your memorandum that you would prefer to people western Canada with those of our own race. I saw a letter recently

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

written by the secretary of a local farming organization in which they complained that a colonization association—I presume under your company—was bringing Russian Mennonites into the irrigated districts, where the women and children go out and work in the fields to assist the men, and the white people in that area—if I may use that term—or the settlers who are already there, feel that they cannot compete with these Russian Mennonites, and feel that the C.P.R. is not living up to their expressed desire of keeping this country Canadian.—A. That does not mean that no one except those of British origin should be allowed to enter Canada. From my knowledge of the west and the western people—and this will be confirmed by your own ministers and others who know—the Mennonites have made very successful settlers.

Q. I do not dispute that, but there are two kinds of Mennonites, as I understand it. There are the Russians and the Germans, and there is quite a difference between them. In this case the people say they are being displaced on the land by those people who get their women to assist them in the fields.—A. That is typical of a great many continentals. The whole family works. I do not think it has done this country any harm.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. That is how they get along.—A. Well, take the Germans: We have, of course, had a certain prejudice toward them for some years, but undoubtedly the Germans are some of our best settlers, as they were some of our best industrialists. You cannot go into the surrounding district of Kitchener without realizing what hard work and thrift have done for these people.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Are we to draw the inference that it will be necessary for the people who are coming in to Western Canada to have their women go out and work?—A. They can settle that for themselves.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. That point is very interesting. Do you consider it fair to even suggest inferentially that it would be a good thing for the wives and daughters of the incoming settlers to undertake work such as that referred to by Mr. Coote, in the fields, chores and the hardships of the farm, which we ourselves would not care to assign to our own women?—A. I do not think that is a question which can be answered.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. You cannot very well forbid them?—A. No.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. What is the average cost of bringing a family of five to Canada?—A. These figures I believe were given you by Mr. Macalister.

Q. I have the figures here and I will give them to you. "Under existing transportation rates a family of five—father, mother and three children—have to realize approximately \$1,000 to enable them to migrate from Europe to Canada." Is that correct?—A. \$200 per head from a point in central or northern Europe?

Q. Yes.—A. I think that is a little high, but not very far out.

Q. Just following that up: do you not think, Mr. Beatty, that one of the great difficulties we have in securing immigrants from Europe, considering its present economic condition and the state of the finances there, is that most of the people composing the desired agricultural population do not find it so readily easy to accumulate \$1,000?—A. The complaint seems to be that it is too easy for them to come.

Q. I am speaking of families of a suitable type.—A. I think they are coming. There may be reasons which I do not know which affect individual countries like Poland and Scandinavian countries, because those governments are not anxious to have their people leave; in fact, they are so anxious to keep them at home that they will not permit us to advertise or solicit for immigrants in those countries, and that will inevitably have an effect on those people. However, we do obtain a considerable number of them, and I think we could obtain more if we went after them. I do not think the money question is a deterrent.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. One of our members from Quebec, Mr. Boulanger, has proposed that transportation facilities at decreased rates should be given to the young men and young women in the eastern provinces who desire to settle in the West so as to place them on a parity, so far as the cost of transportation goes, with incoming settlers from Great Britain and the continent. Have you any suggestion to make as to the advisability of giving greater facilities to the young men and young women who are accustomed to agricultural pursuits in the east to induce them to settle in these western provinces?—A. Well, of course, they can get reduced rates now. The difficulty would be in determining whether they were actual bona fide settlers in each case. I might say, Mr. Cahan, that there is very little money in the passenger business of the Canadian railways under present day conditions. Our general rates are substantially lower than they are in the United States, and if a movement of that kind were intensive, I think it would properly come under the assistance provision of any policy which the government might adopt. But there again you are confronted with that larger question, do you want to induce a man to move into a different part of Canada for the purpose of following the same pursuit? If he fails in the east because of poor land or some other reason, it is natural he would want to go west, and in that case I do not think we would want to put any obstacles in his way, but that is an individual matter, in speaking of the residents of Canada, and is not a matter of immigration at all.

By Mr. Dubuc:

Q. Do you not think that of the many who are going to the United States, colonization would help them, if it were to establish them first on our own lands? Under those conditions do you not think a great many of our young men in the eastern part of the country would stay on the western farms rather than go to the United States?—A. Probably, but of course the lure of the towns is very great.

Q. That is so, but I think that once we gave them some help to bring them away from the lure of the town, they would remain on the farm?—A. That is quite possible.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. I understood you to say that the Scandinavians and northern Europeans made our best farmers. I also understood you to say that we should assist in the passages from the British Isles.—A. Yes.

Q. If the northern Europeans form some of our best settlers, why not also assist them? I do not believe in assistance at all, but if you are going to assist the good farmers from Great Britain why not assist these others as well?—A. I do not think you would be allowed to assist them if you wanted to, because the governments of those countries would not permit you to induce their people to leave under conditions of that kind.

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

Q. Could you not assist them by preparing homes?—A. We could do that, if it were needed, but I do not think it is. The situation in Great Britain is much different from that on the continent. We have not the surplus farming population in Great Britain.

Q. Do you not think that the reason for a great deal of our population leaving this country and going to the United States is because we are bringing more people than we can assimilate into Canada?—A. No. I think it is the extraordinary prosperity of the United States during the last few years, and the opportunities which the young man has over there of immediate employment at good wages or salaries. That applies even to the educated classes. My connection with universities has taught me that a great percentage of our university graduates are confronted immediately upon graduation with the question of where they shall live and where the best openings for them are.

Q. But are not the farmers in western Canada better situated than they are in the United States?—A. I think so.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. What evidence can you produce in support of that?—A. The opinion evidence of others.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. Mr. Beatty, what check has your company upon those whom you state come here "with mental reservations," who do not really intend to go on the farms, but flock to the cities?—A. Not to the extent which I think the question infers; all we can do is to see that their obligations are carried out, that they are actually placed on the farms and given work there.

Q. What is the nature of those obligations?—A. Mr. Macalister can give you the details of that. A man makes a contract with us for placement, and, if he is a single man, we place him on the farm, and he works under that obligation to the farmer. When that obligation expires—which may be in six months or a year or even longer—we have no further control over him.

Q. In your opinion, at least the actual labourer on the farm does not get much more than six months' employment per year?—A. I presume that is right.

Q. So then they will flock to the cities?—A. Sometimes.

Q. Do you not think there should be some responsibility on the railroad which has brought these people to this country to contribute something toward their support, if unemployed for a long period?—A. I should not think so. These men are economic units; they are brought for a purpose; they are presumed to benefit Canada in agriculture, and if in consequence of that, owing to our climate some of them—not all of them are in that position—are unable to work all of the year round, that seems to me to be a condition we have to meet.

Q. You would leave them to charity?—A. Not to charity, no. I think a man should be able to get enough work to keep himself.

Q. Perhaps he should, but do you know if he is able to?—A. Not in all cases perhaps, but in the vast majority of cases, yes.

Q. I wish to draw your attention to a statement made under oath by a member of the Manitoba legislature, before a Committee of this House. It reads as follows:—

A case was brought to our attention in December, of twenty-five Norwegians who had come out in the early Spring, and who could not get any employment, and were in the Immigration offices, and they wanted to be deported. They came up to the Parliament buildings, and Mr. Ivens brought this matter up in the House, and we saw them: I went over to see them, and I found out that their story was absolutely correct. It seems that in the community, in Norway

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

where they lived, inspectors arrived who painted a very luridly wonderful picture of Canada, and these people, assisted by their community, had come out here, presumably to farm. They had positions, jobs, in Norway, but, unable to speak our language as they were, they left their work and came out here, one with a family of seven, and another with a family of six. They went on the land, but they could not make a success of it. They were not placed near people who could help them, and so, some of the single men, and the married families came back to the city, and they had to be sent back to Norway because they could not be placed at all.

Then there is the subject of unemployed single men. We get such a cry from the single men. For two years it has been the policy of the city not to help the single men. They say that single men can get work, if they will go to the bush; or if they will go to the farms on a wage of \$10 or \$15 a month, where they will get their board anyway and their washing done. But there were a great many more single men than there was work for, even on the farms, and, these men were not altogether floaters. They were single men, many of them returned soldiers, who were in Winnipeg, and it did not matter what their age was, young or old, if they went to the Social Service Department, they could not get any assistance at all. Naturally, these men were picked up on the streets as vagrants. A particular case was brought up on the floor of the House, and a Committee appointed to investigate the conditions of the single men. We found that during the past few months, there were 1,700 single men committed to the jails, just picked up because they could not get employment. They are given a bed for one or two nights, and then on the third night if found on the streets, they are taken up as vagrants. In the course of its investigations, the Committee went to the Chief of Police, and to the Provincial jail and interviewed seven or eight men in one day. The men that we saw were splendid types of young manhood, with only one exception. The first morning, we went to the jail we found a young man from the Province who had run away from home; he had just been picked up and was going to be sent back to his home, but I am afraid he should really have been cared for in an institution, rather than sent home.

Q. Do you find many cases of that kind coming up?—A. They have not come to my knowledge.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Is it not a fact that a man coming from the British Isles has to remain in western Canada two or three years before he knows how to farm?—A. Well, he is a better man every year. Every year's experience behind him naturally improves his work. You will find that the preliminary training they give single men at Brandon and other farms in Great Britain is very valuable.

Q. I referred a little while ago to your irrigation scheme. You had a colonization scheme in there. Are your efforts in that respect to assist settlers in that district sufficiently successful to extend them?—A. No, we have not extended them. As a matter of fact, it has been very slow, but it accomplished a very great purpose in the fact that it did make arable a lot of land which was not, and of course the use of irrigated land is increasing every year and the knowledge in respect to farming operations on irrigated land is also increasing.

Q. Are your settlers not continually coming and going?—A. Not to a great extent. The difficulty about irrigated land settlement is in finding the kind of product which will pay these men best. Beet sugar has been a comparatively new development.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Do you know at what price you sold irrigated lands in the Cold River district?—A. No, I do not.

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

Q. That is the district I referred to a few moments ago. If I remember correctly, the letter stated that land repossessed from other settlers already there had been sold to these Russians at a price, I think, around \$150 an acre.

—A. No, we have never sold land as high as that.

—A. You cannot tell us the price at which they are sold?—A. No. not off-hand.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Have you any reason to believe that if the Canadian government went into a colonization scheme they would be more successful than you have been?

—A. I do not know whether you have before you any scheme of irrigation by the government.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. We have been discussing the question of immigration from a land settlement point of view. Inasmuch as 50 per cent of the population of this country is urban, do you not think that some attention should be given to the people who want to be industrialists? Do you not think that where people are prepared to come into the city, with their own funds, and start new enterprises or even enter into competition with enterprises already established, that the government would be well advised to let these people in?—A. I do not know that there is any barrier against it.

Q. There certainly is?—A. From Great Britain?

Q. I think your colonization department would tell you that in the matter of immigration there are only certain selected people permitted to come into this country, for instance, a Roumanian, from a country of 25,000,000 people, is not permitted to come into this country unless he goes on the land. He is not permitted to go into the cities, nor is he permitted to go in to any industrial enterprise. In fact, none of the people of southern Europe are permitted to come in. Take, for instance, the whole of the Mediterranean coast, Italy and the Balkan district; not one man is permitted to come into this country unless he agrees to go on to the land. Is there any objection, on your part, to a man coming in who has his own funds, or who can be guaranteed that he will not become a public charge?—A. I suppose the objection to that would be the opening of the door too widely. I do not know that in the case you mentioned, of a man with means, or some substance, not likely to become a public charge, and able to engage in useful work, that there should be any objection to him coming in, but is that what you are going to get?

Q. If he does not make a success, he is deportable?—A. It is not a good system which depends on deportation.

Q. But the government cannot always hold that as a club over his head. He must make good or get out.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. I understand that at the present time a man with capital, means or scientific or technical knowledge, resident in Belgium or France, is not admitted to this country unless he is going into agricultural employment, unless he makes a special and specific application to the Minister of Immigration, and under difficulties which are almost unsurmountable requests a special permit to come in. I understand that from the entire cotton, woollen and silk manufacturing interests of Belgium and France, no man engaged in those industries, even with technical knowledge and skill and capital of his own, no matter what it may be, is allowed to come in.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Cahan is not correct in that. Belgians and the French can come in, but the restriction applies to the Balkan States and all along the Mediterranean coast, Spain, Portugal, and so forth.

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. I have gone through the regulations with a fine toothed comb, and there is no possibility of their coming in under the regulations now existing, excepting upon a special permit from the Minister.

Mr. FANSHER (Last Mountain): Would you suggest that we allow in a few farm implement manufacturers?

Mr. CAHAN: I am not discussing that, but I suggest that any man with sufficient capital should be allowed to come to this country to assist in manufacturing here what we are now importing.

Mr. HANSON: I am not a member of the Committee, but I am vitally interested in this matter. May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN: What is the wish of the Committee?

(Agreed to).

By Mr. Hanson:

Q. You referred to the attitude of the provincial governments and the functions they should perform. Is it not a fact that the provincial governments are in a better position, together with the railways, to place the men properly?—A. Yes.

Q. And is that not one of the most important functions with respect to the agricultural problem, and are not the provincial governments and the railways co-operating?—A. Yes. We have had conferences with the Prime Ministers of the three eastern provinces, and everybody agreed with what you said, but they pleaded poverty, that they had not the resources to do this work in the way in which it should be done.

Q. If they had the means, are they really not the best instruments for placement?—A. I think they are excellent.

Q. They are closely in touch with conditions?—A. They should be.

Q. And is it not your opinion that that feature should be accentuated before this Committee?—A. Generally speaking, that is my view.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. I think you made it clear that our methods should be devoted to getting an agricultural population. Do you believe that the law of supply and demand sets or affects the price of agricultural products?—A. Yes, but we have not reached the point in the world's consumption of our goods where we need feel very apprehensive about it.

Q. Have you made any study of that question?—A. No, except the knowledge I have of what has happened in the last few years. I cannot conceive of Canada producing suddenly a crop so great that it will adversely affect, to any great extent, the world's price of wheat.

Q. You are referring only to wheat?—A. Yes, the chief product.

Q. Can you imagine Canada producing so much butter that it will depress the price?—A. They have not as yet.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. In view of the statements that the importations of butter from Australia have depressed the prices in Canada, do you not think it would be a simple matter with other products, by increasing the production, to do the same thing?—A. I think it is our own fault there. In New Brunswick, for instance, we have been buying New Zealand butter and New Brunswick is one of the finest dairy provinces in Canada.

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Is it not a fact, if we are going to make farm settlement pay under any conditions, and if we hope to increase land settlement, and increase the value of the land under cultivation, it will not have the tendency to cause still more seasonal unemployment. If we are going to increase the land settlement and produce chiefly and mainly only one food supply, namely, wheat, is it not just a matter of more intensive cultivation of the land now under cultivation, and using more immigrants and thus increasing our immigration, and providing help for the farmers for the land already under cultivation? I make this venture—and I am a farmer—that we could use all the immigration that could be brought into the Dominion of Canada, no matter what efforts might be used, in order that the farms already under cultivation could have that cultivation intensified and the production increased. Is it not a fact, Mr. Beatty, that you must make the farm more profitable by the preservation of the Canadian market for Canadian farmers?—A. Of course, the two things can proceed concurrently, and I think they will. We extend our area under cultivation, and we will see, as is happening in Manitoba and Alberta, a change more and more towards mixed farming. That happened in Wisconsin and Minnesota, two of the most prosperous States in the United States. Originally they grew wheat, and then they gradually changed over. If you run through Wisconsin now you will find numerous prosperous towns of from 20,000 to 30,000, surrounded by a mixed farming territory, with a little manufacturing in the towns.

Q. Do you find any seasonal unemployment in the mixed farming areas?—

A. I do not think you should; I think it should reduce it.

Q. In keeping with Mr. Jacob's suggestion, regarding the policy as to industrial immigration, how can we hope to have any intensive mixed farming in the Dominion of Canada if we have not a substantial increase in the urban population?—A. Our urban population will automatically increase with our industrial progression.

Q. And our mixed farming?—A. And our mixed farming will add to that.

Q. We cannot hope to have a mixed farming increase without an industrial increase?—A. I think the industrial will follow.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. You say that the industrial will follow?—A. With our increased population undoubtedly we will have a greater demand.

Q. In your opinion, agricultural development and prosperity should precede industrial development?—A. Yes.

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL: It always has, since the early days of Canada.

By Mr. Hanson:

Q. Has that been the history of the United States?—A. Yes, that has been their history.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Do you think that that is true in the case of mixed farming; do you think that mixed farming can increase profitably without an industrial increase first taking place?—A. As long as the ratio is not out of proportion, it will, in part. I know what you mean. You mean that a great urban population is an inducement to mixed farming?

Q. I think that is the first inducement, and the only justification for mixed farming?—A. We have not got to the point yet where that is bothering us.

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

Q. It is a fact in Ontario, and it is creeping through the Western provinces, that the increase in mixed farming areas certainly has not been in the districts where there has not been a considerable urban development?—A. I should think that would apply to Ontario, all right.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. Take in Western Ontario, our towns have less population now than they had thirty years ago, and in very many instances we do not sell a thing except the finished product. So that mixed farming is really the secret of the success of agriculture, and the underlying foundation of the success of the country.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. It never came to Western Ontario until after your industrial development took place along the border cities.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): I think we are putting this thing the wrong end about, because increased industry creates mixed farming. I come from a section where that has been fairly well proven in the last twenty-five or thirty years. With the increased population in Toronto and Hamilton, and the surrounding towns, mixed farming has increased because of the demand for the products of the farm.

By Mr. Boulanger:

Q. Have you considered decreased rates to induce more settlers to go to Western Canada from the Eastern part of the country?—A. We have not, except the Farm Labourers Excursions.

Q. Could the Canadian railways afford to grant a special rate, of, say, one cent a mile, to move eastern Canadian settlers, with their families and effects, to the west?

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. You have the settlers' effects rate?—A. Yes.

Q. For carload lots?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. What is the answer to that question?—A. I cannot answer the question because I do not know what would be involved in it. I have told you that we are not making any money out of our passenger business, and I would hate to see those revenues decreased. If it could be shown that it is for the benefit of the country, and we would get our end of that, it would be a different thing. We have decreased rates periodically, but we have not settlers' rates.

Q. To the best of your knowledge, are any of the important industries in Canada suffering from the lack of railway?—A. I do not know that I can answer that, but I should assume they are not.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Wellington North): I understand that the small country of Denmark produces more butter than all of Canada.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. I presume I am right in saying that your Company, along with other organizations, have put forth a great deal of effort to bring agriculturalists to Western Canada. What would you say to the statement that there are fewer farmers in the three prairie provinces to-day than there were five years ago?—A. I have heard that statement, but I do not know whether it is true or not. I think they estimate about 250,000.

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. If that is true, is it not a fact that further extensive land settlement by Continental immigrants will have a tendency, as Mr. Garland and several others have pointed out, to lower the standard of living?—A. No. I think we will always have quite a number of Continentals in our farming operations in the west. The situation which you describe may be due, in part, to larger individual holdings, and, in part, to this seepage which we know is going on.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Is it not a fact that there is a tendency towards larger holdings, due to the different types of farm machinery?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Production has increased?—A. And the acreage under cultivation is increasing.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. In some sections of Western Canada we are using the class of machinery where we expect, in a few years, to do without any help in the fall of the year. We are using combines and are able to get along without any farm help at all.—A. No doubt about that.

By Mr. Garland:

Q. If I remember correctly, I think the Canadian Pacific brought about twenty-one thousand people into Canada in 1926; is that correct?—A. It is a little more than that. I can give you the figures for 1927. From the British Isles, 26,000; from the preferred countries, 11,500; from the non-preferred countries, 18,000; a total of 56,615.

Q. Can you tell the Committee the percentage of Mennonites?—A. No, I cannot. I can get those figures for you.

Q. You are bringing in a very large number of Mennonites?—A. It differs in different years, some years being larger than others.

Q. If these figures are incorrect, I hope you will correct them at a subsequent date. It is my understanding that in 1926 you brought in something over 21,000 immigrants and that about 7,000, or one-third, were Mennonites?—A. I could not tell you off hand, but I can get you those figures.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Could you tell us whether the Mennonites are being largely settled on cultivated lands?—A. I cannot tell you that, but I imagine a good proportion of them are.

Q. Is that really doing anything to increase colonization in Western Canada?—A. Oh, yes. Any man who occupies and works land, whether it has been cultivated before or not, is a settler.

Q. But where he displaces the present settler? I wonder if your Company has kept any record of how many Mennonites are buying farms that are already cultivated and occupied, where they simply change hands?—A. The man occupied it must go some place else.

Q. He leaves the land?—A. Not necessarily.

Q. There is no increased cultivation and no increased production, you simply have transferred the owners? The original owners would have stayed on the farm if there had not been Mennonites to come and take them?—A. I do not know of those cases at all.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. Is it not a fact that on C.P.R. territory south of the line from Gleichen to Cluny, in the Arrowood District, a number of Mennonites came in there and purchased land at around \$45 per acre? This land, up to that time, had been held by men whom the Canadian Pacific Railway had brought, chiefly from Chicago, or around that district. They bought this high priced land, on time payments with some cash, and turned their women and children out in the fields, and they worked as no Canadian or American settler will work. They will not subject their women to that kind of treatment. They drive out the Canadian men, and we are replacing them steadily by a type that is agitating for a separate colony existence. There are three large settlements of that type in my constituency, and I do not think that sort of thing is doing Canada any good?—A. You think the Mennonites should be excluded?

Q. Not necessarily, but they should not be settled in colonies. It would be much more preferable if they were settled on unoccupied land, instead of taking up land occupied by Canadians or Americans?—A. We have no control over the private bargains made by incoming settlers.

Mr. COOTE: Would it not be preferable not to solicit them?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL: Most of these large farms that I know of have simply gone broke and they were mighty glad to have some one to sell to.

Mr. VALLANCE: In the constituency which I have the honour to represent, we had a large farm known as the Excell Farm, which I believe was an American organization. They sold out to what they call the Progressive Mennonites. These people do not live in little villages, but they settle right on the farms. There is a tendency now to bring in these Mennonites to take up occupied land. As Mr. Motherwell says, many of these large holdings have practically gone broke, or the remuneration that they get is conducive to disposing of their holdings.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In the cases which I cited, in the districts of Arrowood and Rockyford, they have not displaced the large holdings at all. I have no doubt that Mr. Vallance is correct in saying that the same condition applies to the large holdings, but in the cases I have cited it does not.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. It has been intimated that the mixed farmers in Minnesota and Wisconsin are very prosperous. I do not know whether you have any definite knowledge of the mixed farming in those districts, but I know, in the constituency that I represent, that we have a great many people coming in there from the mixed farms of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and they tell us that you can go into Minnesota and buy a farm for the price of the buildings. They cannot be very prosperous.—A. The railway receipts are the best evidence of that, and they show that Wisconsin and Minnesota are prosperous.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. That is an evidence of volume but not of prosperity.—A. It is evidence of volume that is being sold.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. Have you any figures giving the amount of new land brought under cultivation, say in the last two years?—A. No, I have not, but I can get them for you.

Q. I have heard it stated that there was a million acres of new land opened up in the summer of 1926, and a million and a half acres in 1927?—A. That is in the prairie provinces?

[Mr. E. W. Beatty.]

Q. Yes.—A. I can easily give you those figures. It is about eight and a half per cent, I think.

By Mr. Boulanger:

Q. The railway companies are carrying European settlers at a reduced rate at the present time?—A. We have regular rates for all settlers, except the assisted passage. You know about that, where they come in on a very low rate. We have a regular third-class rate for these people from Europe, to central points in Canada.

Q. Could not the Canadian railways do the same for Canadians?—A. I do not think so. It is not a question that has been raised, except in connection with farm labour.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. The steamship rates have been reduced materially within the last five years?—A. Yes.

Q. To meet just this situation?—A. Speaking as a steamship owner, I would say they have been reduced too much, Mr. Garland. If you could see our receipts you would agree with me.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Is Colonel Dennis in Canada, or likely to be in Canada at an early date? We have a motion passed by the Committee and we would like to have him attend to give us some information with regard to European immigration?—A. He will be back in Canada on Sunday.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until Thursday, April 26th, at 11.00 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THURSDAY, April 26, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen. Are there any motions this morning?

Mr. BOULANGER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to move that Dr. Barton, Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture of Macdonald College, be called. Dr. Barton has a plan for the assistance of young farmers, especially those who have taken a course in agriculture. In order that the Committee may judge whether it is advisable or not to call Dr. Barton, I would like to read a couple of letters in which Dr. Barton outlines his plan. The first letter which he wrote me is dated March 26, 1928. (Reading):—

DEAR SIR,—Through the kindness of Mr. R. R. Ness of Howick, I received a copy of Hansard containing your speech in the House on proposed government assistance and favourable treatment of Canadians. I read your speech with much interest and should like to say that I thoroughly concur in the ideas you expressed.

As I said to Mr. Ness, I have felt for some time, and I have stated publicly on more than one occasion, that one of the stumbling blocks for Canadian farm boys who want to farm is that they are unable to get a start because no financial provision is available. As you point out, surely our own Canadian boys are a better risk than many of those about whom we know little and upon whom we are pressing assistance.

May I take the liberty of outlining one further thought in connection with your plan. It is this, that the boy, who, in addition to his farm apprenticeship experience, is enthusiastic enough about farming to give himself some special preparation for it, should be given not only every encouragement to do so but also some further opportunity because of it. It seems to me that a boy who takes, say a two-year practical course at an agricultural college, might well be given double the assistance that is available to the boy who is content to depend upon his practical experience alone. No boy would be entitled to such assistance unless he were endorsed by his college as being competent and capable to make good use of it. Such a plan, I feel sure, would give point to preparation for farming in such a way that nothing else could do. The amount of capital necessary should not be difficult for the Government to provide. The plan should, in time, multiply demonstrators by the hundreds; it should develop leadership for agriculture that is too often lacking at present and it should re-enforce the whole rural structure with the kind of material it seems to need.

The agricultural colleges are largely responsible for the marked progress in agriculture during the past thirty years. There is hardly a farmer who has not been touched by them in some way, although he himself may not be aware of it. In the last analysis, if farming is to be improved and raised to the level it should occupy it must be done through

farming people themselves. Direct assistance in one form or another will contribute and help to meet special situations but no great change will be made except as the people, through change in themselves, are enabled to make it. I hold therefore that our Canadian farm boys, the farmers of to-morrow, should be given some preparation just as other people are for the work they intend to undertake. As matters stand now, the farm boy gets less than any one else. His school is the poorest, and his opportunity for many forms of personal development are limited. This may not be the immediate concern of the Dominion Government, but as it affects agriculture it is a national question. Anything that will induce boys to better themselves for better opportunities and at the same time contribute to the general advancement of Canadian agriculture is worthy of any Government's serious consideration.

Yours faithfully,

“(Sgd.) H. BARTON,
Dean.”

P.S. May I add that this difference between \$2,500 and \$5,000 advance would be a significant but very appropriate distinction.

H.B.”

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. BOULANGER: Apparently, I do not need to read the other letter.

Mr. SPOTTON: I second the motion, Mr. Chairman, that Dr. Barton be called.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by Mr. Boulanger, and seconded by Mr. Spotton, that Professor Barton of Macdonald College be asked to appear before the Committee. Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the motion?

I declare the motion carried.

Any other motions?

We have this morning, gentlemen, Canon Burd, representing Bishop Lloyd of Saskatchewan. The Bishop of Saskatchewan requested that the Committee give Canon Burd a hearing and he is here this morning to give evidence.

Rev. Canon WALTER BURD called and sworn.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, Canon Burd is before you, if you wish to examine him, or would you prefer that he make a statement?

SEVERAL MEMBERS: That he make a statement.

By the Chairman:

Q. Are you prepared to make a statement, Canon Burd?—A. Yes.

Q. The floor is yours then; you may be seated.—A. I prefer to stand. I can handle my material a little better, perhaps.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, first of all I wish to thank you for the privilege of allowing me to appear before you as representative of the diocese of Saskatchewan. May I first of all make quite clear as to whom I do represent, so that there will be no misunderstanding. While I was a member of the General Synod, which met at Kingston, I am not representing that General Synod, for the General Synod only meets once in every three years, and unless they appoint a representative for a special purpose, at their triennial meeting, it is impossible

[Canon W. Burd.]

to represent them, unless specially appointed to do so by the Primate. My reason for being here is on the invitation of the Committee at the request of the Bishop of Saskatchewan, who desired that one of the dioceses that is receiving a great deal of immigration should be represented; so, officially, I represent the diocese of Saskatchewan, but I represent the whole church just insofar as the material I bring before you is the expression of the whole church as contained in the Journals of the Synod.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Mr. Chairman, at this point I wish to inform the Canon that I have definite information from the Church that you do not represent anything but the diocese of Saskatchewan.

WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Forke. Then may I correct that, if it needs correction. The information I give to you in regard to the whole Church is official as contained in its journals. I have the journals with me. I thank you for making that point just a little clearer. I do not claim in any way to represent the whole Church.

I have divided my material into three different sections. First of all an introduction; then dealing with the question overseas; then the questions in the Department itself; and then the questions as they affect us in the western provinces. I am confining myself absolutely to evidence; that is to statements which can be proved. There has been a great deal of impressionable information given on this subject. Men have the idea that this or that is so, but when it comes to proving these things with figures, it has been quite a different matter. And just as in the General Synod, I was very careful to make no statement I could not prove, so to-day, I have before me, gentlemen, the evidence which will corroborate anything I will say. If you are not satisfied, please check me up, and I will withdraw that as evidence.

First of all, the general attitude of our church towards this question of immigration; we are absolutely friendly towards the Department. Our disposition is friendly. We are not here—at least I am not here—in any spirit of aggression, or fault-finding. Our whole desire as a diocese out there, and I think here I can speak for the whole Church—our whole desire is to co-operate to the full in building up this country to its best. And so, will you please feel that our attitude is at once friendly, and our desire is to be helpful.

The journal I have in my hand is the journal of the proceedings of the diocese of Saskatchewan, for 1927. In this journal there is to be found the memorial on immigration which was brought up at the General Synod and which began a great deal of the discussion there. May I read that memorial for your information?

The Memorial of the Diocese of Saskatchewan respectfully sheweth:

Whereas the census returns of 1921 give the membership of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada as about 3,000,000; and the Church of England membership, the Presbyterian and the United Church membership over four millions;

And whereas the Minister of Immigration of the Canadian Government has stated that twenty-five Roman Catholic priests, and one priest of the Church of England, and one minister of the United Church are employed as immigration agents by the Department;

Resolved, that this synod of Saskatchewan respectfully memorialize the general synod of the Church in Canada to bring to the attention of the Minister of Immigration this glaring unfairness, and to ask that the Minister take steps to rectify this inequality forthwith;

And that they approach the Minister in co-operation with the chief councils of the Presbyterian church and the United Church of Canada.

[Canon W. Burd.]

That was carried. I might also say that it was moved in amendment, but was not approved of:—

That the Department be requested to dismiss the present clergy, acting as immigration agents and that adequate proportionate lay representation of all churches be substituted.”

We felt that it would not be well to do that. Our church is divided into districts for governments, first of all into dioceses, which are units within the province; then we have what we call the Ecclesiastical Provinces, which is a grouping together of a number of these dioceses. In my hand I have the Journal of the Provincial Synod of the Church of England, which met in Regina in September, 1926. This includes all the Western provinces, that is, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan; all the Church dioceses within those provinces. May I quote from our Primate, who is the President of that Assembly? He is speaking, first of all, of the necessity of doing our utmost for the new Canadians, and making them into loyal Canadian subjects. (Reads):

But I want to say very frankly that, just in order to ensure these great desiderata in the future for the inhabitants of our Dominion, we shall need to maintain a preponderating amount of the inheritance of the best traditions and sentiments which have made Great Britain what it is. We have all heard North West Canada called a ‘melting pot’, and it may be such in the production of its ultimate citizenship. What will come out of that melting pot will vitally depend upon the controlling elements which we put into it. It may be claimed that even a little leaven can leaven the whole lump, but it seems to me that much will depend upon the quantity of leaven and its proper proportions. It is said that in 1901, for example, fifty-seven per cent of our population was of British origin; in 1921 the proportion had dropped to fifty-five per cent. Is it safe to permit the drop to go lower until the preponderance is in another direction? That is my point, and we may well raise the danger signal, not because we depreciate other classes of settlers and do not welcome them, on the contrary, we do welcome them,—but because we are convinced that in the settling of a country economic conditions alone should not dominate us and make us shut our eyes to other things that are essential.

I have the Journal of Proceedings of the General Synod of the Church of England, and I will just briefly touch upon the action of the General Synod on that immigration question. The General Synod represents the whole of the Church of England in Canada, from coast to coast. First of all, in the report of the Council of Social Service, on page 85, it was moved by the Bishop of Toronto, and seconded by Canon Vernon:—

That the General Synod, recognizing that the Government of Canada and its Department of Immigration and Colonization have been taking steps to secure an increasing British migration to Canada, desires to pledge the co-operation of the Church of England in Canada, through its Council for Social Service and its British representatives the Church of England Council of Empire Settlements, in this matter, and at the same time to urge the calling together by the Government of Canada at the earliest possible opportunity of a conference representing the Dominion and Provincial Governments, the churches, all voluntary organizations interested in immigration, and the transportation companies, to discuss the practical details involved in carrying out a still more extended policy of preferential British immigration, and to secure the fullest possible co-operation of all concerned.

[Canon W. Burd.]

The General Synod deleted that first part, and it was moved by W. G. Styles, seconded by Canon Heeney, and,

“Resolved, That the preamble of the Resolution ‘recognizing to Canada’ be deleted.”

That is, the Synod refused to recognize that the Government of Canada had taken active steps to secure more British immigrants.

On page 87 of that same Synod Journal—this is the action of the General Synod, representing the whole Church—the following amendment to the amendment was moved by the Bishop of Saskatchewan, and seconded by the Bishop of Toronto,

The General Synod of the Church of England in Canada recognizing the vital need of maintaining our British connections, our British ideals, and our British institutions, and believing that the preponderance of Continental over British immigration to Canada is likely to lower seriously existing standards of wages and living conditions, the maintenance of which is in the best interests alike of the foreign born and those of British stock, desires to urge upon the Government of Canada the adoption of a quota policy to limit the number of certain classes of foreign born immigrants admitted during any year to not more than fifty per cent of the British born admitted during the preceding years.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. That was the resolution that was forwarded to me, as being the opinion of the General Synod?—A. I believe so, yes.

Q. The other resolution was not carried?—A. Pardon me, it was, with those words deleted.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. The first resolution was amended and carried?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you not leave out an important part? You presented the Memorial that you have just read, the Memorial which had been passed by the Synod of Saskatchewan, and you moved that the matter be received and referred to a special committee, and that motion was lost?—A. That was lost yes.

Q. You have not mentioned that?—A. I am coming to that directly.

Q. That took place before what you have just spoken of?—A. Yes, but it comes in later. I was bringing the whole matter up under the one heading.

Q. I do not think that we get a proper view of what took place at the Synod by considering this general resolution, and then jumping to the resolution which was passed, without showing what took place in the meantime. That is, the Synod did not adopt the resolution, or even consider the Memorial which was presented by the Synod of Saskatchewan?—A. The two things were entirely separate. One was the report of the Social Service Council, which I have just discussed, and the resolution was that of the Social Service Council. I wanted to deal with the work of the Social Service Council entirely. I do not intend to leave anything out in regard to the Memorial itself. This appears on page 85.
(Reads):—

Moved by Canon Burd, seconded by Canon Armitage, That the matter contained in the Memorial of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, re Immigration Agents, be received and referred to a special committee appointed by the Chair for action.

[Canon W. Burd.]

That was after the Synod, as a whole, refused to accept the Memorial as it was. It was then referred to this Committee, as I have just said, and that Committee reported on page 89 as follows:—

Moved by Canon Burd, seconded by Dr. A. H. Moore, and

Resolved, That this General Synod appoint a deputation to wait upon the Government of Canada for the purpose of requesting that equal facilities be granted to the Church of England in Canada in dealing with immigration as are granted to other Christian Communion in Canada.”

That was carried.

Q. That was the resolution that was carried by the whole Synod?—A. Yes.

Q. That was the main resolution?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Could you not give in detail what took place. I think you have again, unwittingly, no doubt, left out an important part, namely, that the motion that you made that this matter contained in the Memorial of the Diocese of Saskatchewan be received and referred to a special committee appointed by the Chair, on being put to a vote, was lost?—A. I am sorry; I thought I had just made that clear.

Q. I thought you said that it was carried?—A. No, I said that the motion to have it dealt with was lost, and then it was referred to this Committee. May I have that page, please?

Q. Page No. 86.—A. I want to make that quite clear.

Q. Would it not be better if we just had that on the Record?—A. I am quite agreeable that that should be done.

Moved by Canon Andrew, seconded by Mr. J. W. Shore, and

Resolved, That, with reference to the Memorial from the Diocese of Saskatchewan, a committee consisting of Canon Burd, Canon Heeney, Dean Llwyd, Archdeacon Fotheringham, Canon Armitage and Dr. A. H. Moore, be appointed to bring in a Resolution of a constructive character dealing with the matter referred to in the Memorial, and that Canon Burd be Convener of the Committee.

That finished the section on the general introduction, showing the interest the Church has taken in the discussion of immigration, and showing that the Church, in its General Synod, was seriously concerned with the present situation, and asked the Government to place a quota on the foreign immigration not to exceed fifty per cent of the previous year's British immigration. That, I believe, was forwarded to the Department.

Now, I have the first of three sections. This is dealing with the opinion in England, and overseas, in regard to Canada's attitude towards British immigration. That, Mr. Chairman, is a very serious part of this discussion. If the general opinion in Great Britain is that Canada does not want British immigrants, it is, indeed, a serious thing, and it is a condition which must be removed. It may be that there are no grounds for that belief, if that belief exists, but I think we are all agreed, that if the belief does exist in Great Britain, or the British Isles, that Canada does not want British immigrants, then it is a situation which must be changed.

I have here a small amount of material, not giving my own view at all, but the view of those who are in position to understand. First of all, to take up South Africa. We find that this question of Canada's attitude is not one confined to England, but to the whole Empire. I have in my hand a cutting from the *Cape Times* of October 29, 1927. This deals with the general subject of

Inter-Empire immigration. I believe the *Cape Times* is the leading paper in that section of the British Empire, in the Union of South Africa. I will leave this as evidence, so it can all be gone through.

INTER-EMPIRE MIGRATION

More than once of late we have referred to the unsatisfactory practical effects of present tendencies in European migration to and from this country. Though it is no doubt desirable to increase our white population as rapidly as our powers of economic absorption will allow, we have always held that the quality of immigrants is for South Africa a far more important consideration than their quantity. For this reason we view with particular misgiving the course which migration has followed now for too many years. As we showed the other day, South Africa is making a net loss of British subjects, and a net gain of aliens, three-quarters of whom come from racial stocks which experience has shown to be unsuitable to the peculiar conditions of this country. The fact that the net gain of aliens is larger than the net loss of British subjects, and that therefore the country can point to a small surplus of European immigrants over European emigrants, we are unable to regard as a matter for congratulation. For, in spite of the slight quantitative gain, we are losing in quality all the time. And the relations of the two main white races of South Africa are, it is to be feared, not well calculated to assist in turning alien immigrants of different race into good South Africans in any short space of time.

It is instructive to compare the experience of other Dominions with our own in this matter. In Canada, for example, as indeed almost everywhere else, the primary need has always been to establish the bulk of the immigrant population on the land. Two alternative policies have thus naturally presented themselves, and successive Canadian Governments have had to choose broadly between importing farmers, largely of alien blood, and then making good Canadians of them, and, on the other hand, importing British subjects and then turning them into farmers. *Before the war the tendency was, on the whole, to give precedence to immigrants of British stock. Since then, a possibly inevitable swing of the pendulum has brought the other policy into operation. In consequence, Western Canada, where the bulk of the immigrant farming population settles, has been rapidly filling up with aliens, and the Prairie Provinces have for some time been the chief centre of opposition to the development of closer and more fraternal relations with the rest of the British Commonwealth.* So marked has this opposition become that responsible Canadians have freely asserted that it may result in the complete swamping of British sentiment in Western Canada, and even in Western Canada's eventual loss to the Empire. The present Minister of Immigration, Mr. Robert Forke, comes from Manitoba, and is strongly identified with the prevalent Western Canadian feeling. Another factor operating in practice to the detriment of British immigration appears to have been dragged in by the religious rivalry which to non-Canadians seems so strange a feature of Canadian life. *The official head of the Immigration Department is known to be a Roman Catholic of vigorous proselytising proclivities. Since his appointment many complaints have been made of undue Roman Catholic influence in immigration affairs.* Government recognition and assistance of voluntary Immigration Societies has been withdrawn. These societies, of which the Salvation Army is perhaps the most important, are mostly connected with Protestant sects of one denomination or

another, and all are tried sources of British immigrants. Opponents thus argue that the effect of the Government policy is clear, even if its motive is obscure. The conclusiveness of the argument seems, however, conditional upon the use made of the independent immigration machinery which the Government is at the same time attempting to set up. Yet, whatever the causes, the fact remains that the percentage of British immigrants is at present steadily falling. In 1925 it was 41.7; in 1926 35.9; and this year it is expected to be lower still. In these circumstances it is not surprising to find signs that the pendulum is about to make a return swing. Concerted attacks on the Government's immigration policy are being made from numerous quarters. The Press is calling attention to the "alien peril"; the Anglican Churches are raising the cry of "Canada for the British"; and the Conservative Party, the official Opposition, appears to be making the matter a plank in its platform.

One result of the Canadian Government's recent attitude has been to deflect to Australia British immigrants who might otherwise have gone to Canada. The position is plainly shown by the following table comparing British migration for the four years preceding the war with that for the last four years:—

	1911-14	1923-26
To Canada.....	554,298	197,477
To Australia and New Zealand.....	254,315	205,434
Total.....	808,613	402,911

In other words, though emigration from Great Britain is less than half what it was before the war, British immigration to the Antipodes has dropped by a mere fifth, while in the case of Canada the drop has been nearly two-thirds. Looking, then, at inter-imperial migration as a whole, we find that of immigrants to Australia *over 70 per cent.* are *British* and the proportion is rising; for New Zealand the percentage is *nearly 100*; and for Rhodesia *about 90*. Canada, on the other hand, is for the most part importing aliens from North of Europe, while South Africa is importing aliens from Southern and Eastern Europe. The Empire has never in any direction set any pedantic store by homogeneity, and doubtless there are sound scientific arguments in favour of diluting new British settlements with a reasonable proportion of foreign stocks. But when that proportion rises beyond a certain point, there is a real risk of endangering the continuity of the development of those broad ideals, upon whose conservation and general acceptance throughout the British Commonwealth the health, the solidarity, and the prosperity of the Empire alike depend. In Canada and South Africa particularly a careful revision of policy is now evidently due.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Is that an editorial?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Are you suggesting that that part of the Empire is an authority on what is being done in Canada?—A. No, not at all. I am merely giving that as the general impression of the Empire.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. Are you suggesting that the British people would take that as Canada's attitude?—A. I think they would in South Africa.

[Canon W. Burd.]

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Would you consider that as evidence?—A. I think it is evidence of the general opinion of the Empire.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. You are suggesting, then, that if one paper in South Africa makes a statement that it would be considered as good evidence throughout the Empire?—A. It is contributory evidence. If there was no mention from South Africa we could take it as evidence that South Africa was not really concerned. I am not saying that you must accept that as the opinion of South Africa, but it is the opinion of the editor of the *Cape Times*.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. And do you agree with that?—A. Not in every detail.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. That is not your opinion, , the contents of that editorial?—A. No, not in detail.

Mr. SPOTTON: I would just like to make this suggestion. As each witness has appeared before this Committee he has been asked to make a statement, and the last two witnesses, and many others, were allowed to make that statement without interruption.

Some hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. SPOTTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this suggestion, in all fairness to this witness. This gentleman has appeared before this Committee, and he has been asked to make a statement. The two last witnesses and many others were allowed to make their statements without interruption.

Hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. SPOTTON: Or, there were no questions to be asked. More than that, the two last witnesses were not sworn; this witness has been. I think we should do him the courtesy of letting him make a statement, and not let him just make one-third of his statement. I just ask the same courtesy for this witness as was extended to the other witnesses, that he be allowed to make his statement, and to answer questions afterwards.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I think the other gentlemen were expressing their own opinions, in a carefully considered statement, as the record will show and were frequently interrupted. I interrupted this witness first. This gentleman is here, giving us the contents of a book which he has in his hand. I have the same book in my hand. It is important, for the continuity of the record, that the full extracts, or, any extracts the Committee wish to bring out should be brought out now rather than at the end of the discussion.

Mr. SPOTTON: But he should be allowed to make his statement first.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: He is making a statement to the Committee, and the Committee has some rights. I think the Committee would appreciate having it put in the form of question and answer, so that we can understand it. He did not say that he agreed with the statement in the *Cape Times* in detail. I think it is competent for the Committee to find out whether the clipping which Mr. Burd read does represent his opinion or not, because I take it that we are getting Mr. Burd's opinions rather than the opinions of the *Cape Times* just now. We can read the *Cape Times* ourselves, just as well as Mr. Burd can.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it has been the practice of the Committee to ask questions of gentlemen who are giving evidence, and as long as it is not done

[Canon W. Burd.]

too frequently, I think it should be allowed, but that is for the Committee to decide. I think we are here to get information, and if a question will elicit the information we are asking for, it is all right.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I do not think we are discourteous in any way, and I do not think Mr. Burd takes it as such.

The WITNESS: I am entirely in the hands of the Committee, and I will welcome any questions upon the point. I agree with this gentleman that I think it is advisable to let me make my statement first, and then bring it up in the form of questions. I think Colonel Ralston has been quite in order, and I welcome his interruptions.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Thank you very much.

WITNESS: I have in my hand the Hansard of the British House of Commons, also a statement by Brigadier General Sir Henry Page Croft, C.G.M., of the British Parliament. It is headed: Need of Educational Propaganda:—

The suggestion has recently been made that an Empire Settlement Publicity Board should be appointed on the lines of the Empire Marketing Board.

No one who is interested in the problem of Empire migration can be satisfied with the present state of affairs. At the moment all sorts of difficulties and restrictions upon British migrants are imposed by the Dominions, whilst at the same time the Secretary of Labour in the United States is demanding a larger number of workers and settlers from Great Britain.

It is a strange coincidence that whilst the Dominions need above everything else greater populations, a larger number of taxpayers and ratepayers and an increased purchasing power in their home market, the United States apparently regards the British as the flower of the world emigrants, and are described by Mr. Davis, the United States Labour Minister, as a 'brainless and ingenious type'.

The new Immigration Bill which was introduced in the Senate of the United States, more than doubles the quota of British migrants, which is a great tribute to the worth of our people as recognized in America.

Surely, it is deplorable that whilst the United States should think fit to double this quota of British emigrants, there is all this hesitation and difficulty in the absorption of our people in the Dominions amongst their own kith and kin.

That is the opinion of Brigadier General Sir Henry Page Croft. It is not dated. It came within the last month, from England.

I have here under date of February 24th, 1928, an account of the Empire Settlement Bill. I think this more than anything else reflects the opinion of the British Isles in regard to this question of Canada's attitude towards Immigration.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. Is there any other country that you know of that is giving greater assistance to British Immigration in the way of assisted passages than Canada?—A. I would rather not deal with that subject at present. I would rather go on with my evidence.

Q. But do you know of any country that is giving greater assistance to British Immigrants than Canada?—A. No, I do not. Can you bring that up in the form of a question, when I am through with my evidence? The Bill was brought in by Mr. Somerville under the title "Empire Settlement Bill." I will leave this with you as a whole.

[Canon W. Burd.]

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Mr. Somerville makes a very short statement there as to Immigration, in regard to the difficulty of getting British agricultural people to go to Canada. Will you read that?—A. Yes. I have that here.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the members of the Committee sitting in the front row would speak a little louder, so that we may hear their remarks and get a better idea of what is being said.

WITNESS: The statement I believe Hon. Mr. Forke has asked for is as to no lack of candidates.

Why is it, in the case of all these encouragements to Immigration—

Your point has been covered there.

—all the work done by the Department and by these great agencies, that the results are so inadequate? There are several reasons. There is no lack of candidates for assisted passages;

That is one point we should note well.

but there are many hindrances. In the first place, there is the hindrance of bad trade. As long ago as 1885 Sir Robert Giffen, head of the Statistical Department of the Board of Trade, laid down the proposition, which is no doubt familiar to hon. Members, that migration is greatest in times of good trade and less in lean years. The reason is that when new countries are prosperous they attract capital and capital attracts labour.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. What did you say about bad trade?—A. When trade is bad migration is less.

Recent years have been lean years in the British Empire, but happily things show signs of improvement. Then there are our schemes of social insurance. The House will be familiar with the Maclean Report which examined the question as to how far our schemes of social insurance interfere with the law of migration, and the conclusion that Committee came to was that the effect of these schemes on migration was not at present great, but that it might increase as it may cause a feeling of security amongst workers which would render them more and more unwilling to leave the shelter of that security. The report noted, I read it with regret, that the tendency was greatest amongst the young. That is due partly to the fact that the parents are not willing to allow their boys to go in bad times when they can add to the family income,—

Is that the part you want, Mr. Forke?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: No. I will find it.

WITNESS: My next quotation is from some remarks made by Mr. Lunn; he shows that the British House of Commons is willing to vote the money.

In the six years in which the Act has been in operation we might have spent up to £18,000,000 to assist migration in agreed schemes. Up to now we have spent less than £3,500,000. That is not the fault of this country, as there are always thousands more people wanting to go to the Dominions voluntarily than the Dominions can take.

My next quotation is from an address by Sir N. Moore:

I do not make speeches about emigration, though I used to be very enthusiastic and make many speeches, and get people who were desirous of going out, but I found that there were so many hindrances placed in their way, and so many regulations discovered in cupboard, and when you gave men who were anxious to go out letters to the Overseas officers,

[Canon W. Burd.]

these officials always seemed to find some reason against their going out just then. They say, "You come along in three months' time, and it will be all right." There seems to be some sinister policy behind it. When an opportunity to emigrate is found for people, some reason is put forward for not giving them a passage.

That is at page 2011 of the Parliamentary Debates of the House of Commons, February 24, 1928.

I also have a statement here from Lord Lovat, Under Secretary of State for the Dominions, which is referred to in a publication issued by The Fellowship of the Maple Leaf:

On the other hand, Lord Lovat, Under Secretary of State for the Dominions, at a recent conference, said Canada House had a waiting list of British families desirous to emigrate. Mr. Saxon Mills pertinently asks in the *Times* why, if we have a waiting list in this country, how comes it that there is a large and increasing flow of immigrants from the Continent into Canada.

I have in my hand the official publication of the Overseas Settlement Department of the Dominions Office, Caxton House, Westminster. The figures in this publication are absolutely official. It states that from May, 1922, until December, 1927, the period of the operation of this Empire Settlement Act, there had been 74,509 assisted passages to Canada and 176,676 to Australia and New Zealand.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Will you read this passage? I have it marked?—A. I will leave that until I have finished this point. My point is this: Australia is farther away from England, as compared with Canada. The British people do not wish to go far away from their own folks. Australia has no more, and I would say not as many attractions to put forward as Canada has. I have heard of people going to Australia who said afterwards that they would now like to go to Canada. The assisted passages to Australia amount to four or five times the assisted passages to Canada. The assisted rate to Australia is £11 for each parent, which means married couples (including widows or widowers with at least one child under nineteen years of age), as compared with £2 to Canada. Domestic workers go free to Australia. Other adults £16.10.0 as compared with £3 to Canada. The regular fare to Canada is £18.5.0, that is, to St. John, and £19.15.0 to Montreal. The regular fare to Australia is twice that, £37 and upwards. Now in spite of this extra cost to Australia, in spite of the extra distance, in spite of what is in my own opinion a less favourable country (but that is a matter of debate) there have been 176,000 people go to Australia and New Zealand under that scheme as compared with 74,000 to Canada. I leave these facts with you, gentlemen, emphasizing this point, that I hope I have made it clear (as I am convinced) that there are in the British Isles restrictions against Canada, and that has reacted upon the people to the extent that there are twice as many who have gone to Australia as have come to Canada, in recent years.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I do not want to make objections, but this is so utterly out of line with the correct figures that I must give my figures. Last year the assisted passages to Canada amounted to 39,351, and to Australia 36,914, nearly 3,000 more to Canada than to Australia, under the assisted passage scheme.

WITNESS: We are quoting different figures, Mr. Forke. My figures are for the period covered by the British Empire Settlement Act.

[Canon W. Burd.]

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Have you the figures for last year? Is it not a fact that assisted passages to Australia apply to other than agricultural classes?—
A. Yes.

Q. Would that not be rather a substantial reason for the difference?—A. It would be one of the reasons.

Q. It would be a rather substantial one?—A. It would be substantial, yes.

Q. And the reason you read the addresses from the members of parliament in England who say there is a waiting list of those desiring to come to Canada—they do not suggest there is a waiting list of those qualified? It is only people who desire to come to Canada? Is that correct?—A. I give you the statement as I find it. I am not quoting my own opinion. They say "A waiting list under that scheme," and I would take it—

Q. I think the waiting list is that of a lot of people who want to come to Canada and get the benefit of the assisted passage scheme.—A. Lord Lovat, Under-Secretary of State for the Dominions, at a recent conference said, "Canada has had a waiting list of British families desiring to emigrate." He does not state the scheme.

Q. Who was the other fellow? Was it Mr. Lunn?—A. He speaks about the men available. "It is not the fault of this country as there are always thousands more people want to go to the Dominions voluntarily than the Dominions can take." No, not necessarily under that scheme, but those who are desirous of coming out to Canada.

Q. Do you know anything to stop them?—A. I will come to that directly. That completes the first section, Mr. Chairman. If there are any questions on this section, I would be glad to try to answer them.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Will you read that statement?—A. In answer to Mr. Forke's request I will read the section he has marked. I wish to emphasize again, Mr. Chairman, that all I want to do is to give the full facts to the Committee, and I do not object to questions along that line so long as they are not unnecessarily wasting time. I have not come all the way from Saskatchewan to rush this thing through, and I might as well spend a little more time and have the facts brought to light. (Reading):—

We have to look at the facts, and what do we find? In Canada land and domestic workers are assisted but these are the very kind of people we want to keep here. We do not want to comb out our countrysides. The supply of skilled agricultural labour is only just adequate, and in some districts the skilled work is falling into the hands of elder men. We cannot get a sufficient supply of young men to take their places. Those who represent agricultural constituencies, and mine is largely an agricultural division, felt rather surprised when Mr. Bruce Walker was allowed to comb out our countryside.

Then I might read a few words farther:—

We want to take the people from the congested towns, and there are many people with agricultural knowledge who have drifted into our towns, give them a short training and send them out, relieving the congestion in our towns and giving them a future.

My next section deals with the department itself and I have some things which I would be glad to have cleared up, because the sooner we can clear them up the better it will be for all concerned.

By Mr. Ross (Moosejaw):

Q. As I understand it, under the assisted passage scheme, people may be nominated from this country who would be looked after, after they got here, by organizations and could be nominated for assistance in the old country by people there. Have you, as a church in Saskatchewan, ever nominated any of these people and had them refused?—A. I have that evidence now, and I will deal with that in a moment, if you will wait for your answer.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. You quoted from the British Hansard, a moment ago, stating that they had thousands of city dwellers in England who had some kind of agricultural qualifications, having gone from the farms to the towns, and who would be willing to come to Canada. Do you suggest that these people are not allowed to come?—A. I have no suggestion to make at all. I was quoting the gentlemen concerned.

Q. Are you aware of the fact that there is no impediment to these people coming?—A. I did not suggest that there was; I was simply asked by Mr. Forke to read that statement.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: You were not asked to read it all, but you read it.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. I was under the impression, when you compared returns of the numbers of immigrants who went to Australia, they were those who had gone to Australia under the assisted passage scheme.—A. Yes.

Q. Is it not a fact that Australia adopted this scheme a year or two earlier than Canada did?—A. I cannot say; I have no knowledge on that point.

I dislike very much to bring up this matter again—I am tired of hearing it myself—but it should come in evidence that special privileges are given by the Department to organizations. At the General Synod I was the one chosen to bring up this matter, which had been discussed in our local Synod—the question of assisting agents from the various departments. We received in the Prince Albert Ministerial Association a letter from the Assistant Deputy Minister giving us a list of 25 who were on the staff of the Immigration Department for immigration purposes, and of these one was an Anglican, whom I did not know, one whom we took to be United Church, although he was not United Church, but a Lutheran: I took the trouble to get a copy of Hansard, which I have here, of April last giving a list of those ministers and religions who are in any way connected with the Department, and I find here a list of 28—

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. Have you the date of that statement in Hansard?—A. Yes, sessional paper 112, Thursday, March 3rd, 1927, a return to an order of the House of Commons dated February 24th, 1927, showing the names and salaries and expenses of all clergy, indicating the nominations, employed in government work in Canada, the United States, Great Britain, Ireland and on the Continent of Europe. There are the names of 28 gentlemen who are employed in Canada. Twelve of these are on salary, one at \$1,320 and the rest at \$600 per annum. The balance are apparently only on expenses and some of them have nothing opposite their names for expenses. This is a statement for ten months, and either they had no expenses for that year or else their accounts had not come in, but would come in in the next two months. This was the official list, 28, and every one of them is a Roman Catholic priest.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. There were sixteen on expenses only?—A. Yes. In Great Britain and Ireland there is Father Macdonnell, the Rev. J. A. Winfield, Anglican, no expenses and no salary. We tried to locate this gentleman, but we could not find him.

[Canon W. Burd.]

Hon. Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): He is in Prince Edward Island.

The WITNESS: Apparently he was not functioning at the time. And then the Rev. Theo. Wedekind, a Lutheran. The total salary account was \$9,720. Some of these men had expenses of almost \$2,000, one man having \$2,200. The total expenses were \$19,064.41 for the Roman Catholic priests, making a total of \$28,784.41, salaries and expenses.

Now, the statement is made by the Department that the reason all these Roman Catholic priests were employed was that they were employed as repatriation Fathers, and were used solely for repatriating French-Canadians in the United States and bringing them back to Canada. We have every good reason to believe that they were not solely used for that purpose, but that they were to a very great extent used for transferring French-Canadian from the province of Quebec into the western provinces.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Do you make that statement of your own knowledge?—A. Of my own knowledge. I have proof here which I am sorry I cannot use, but it is confidential. I have proof which substantiates that, but I make that as my own statement. We got that in two ways: one was that French people whom we knew went to the office in Montreal and obtained the information that they were doing that, and we had it from another channel which I am pledged not to use. But the point is this: when the Anglican Church went to the Department they were refused the same privilege. This was just before Mr. Forke went into office, and we do not blame him for that.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You mean the same privilege in regard to bringing in British people?—A. Yes. I have in my hand a signed statement from the Bishop of Saskatchewan, dated April 21, 1928, which I will read. This is dated Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, April 21, 1928, and is as follows:—(Reading).

Having pointed out to Mr. Stewart, who then had charge of Immigration, the unfair discrimination on the part of his department in favour of Roman Catholic immigration projects, Mr. Stewart was very nice about it and said they did not want to be unfair and were quite willing to do for the Church of England as much as for the Romanists. I then outlined what I wanted viz. the cost of one Church of England representative divided between two men and Mr. Stewart agreed.

In February of 1925 I put the whole project before the Executive Committee of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and they passed a resolution, 'that we approve of the immigration proposals outlined by the Bishop.'

These proposals were for two men, one to stay in England and collect the settlers, and one to travel backward and forward and find and place the people in this diocese. The Synod to pay the stipend of \$100 per month each and the Department to find the expenses not to exceed a like amount.

About the end of March, I left for the Old Country calling in on Mr. Stewart to tell him that the Synod had agreed to the arrangement. We discussed the matter again and I gave the Minister the name of the first man, Mr. Harding, then in England. I then went on to St. John to sail for England to put the arrangement into effect.

A certain official, when he heard what I was going to do, suggested that it would be better to get the agreement with the Department in writing.

[Canon W. Burd.]

On that I wired to Mr. Stewart to confirm the agreement for two men and received a reply just as my vessel sailed, that the Department found they had overdrawn their appropriation.

The Synod paid the three months stipend to Mr. Harding for holding back from another appointment on my cable from Ottawa telling him we wanted him for immigration work.

I have suspected since that the wire came from Mr. Egan and not from Mr. Stewart. Therefore I was greatly rejoiced when Mr. Forke took charge of the Department of Immigration.

I think the Department of Immigration, at least from its British side, would be far more efficient if Mr. Egan were moved to some other Department.

(Signed) GEORGE EXTON LLOYD,
Bishop of Saskatchewan.

By Mr. McKenzie:

Q. Are we to understand, from your statement, Canon Burd, that 28 appointments were made by Mr. Stewart?—A. I do not know who made the appointment at all.

Q. You have not a record of the appointments?—A. No.

By the Chairman:

Q. Was this letter addressed to the Committee or to you?—A. It was given to me to present to you, gentlemen, and I leave it with you as evidence.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. Have you made any inquiries as to whether these twenty-eight were appointed?—A. No, that could be easily obtained by the Committee.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Are you stopping there? Have you finished with that?—A. Yes.

Q. I suppose you know, from inquiry, that the practice has been for many years to employ French Canadian priests carrying on repatriation and colonization work? I mean, by successive Governments; it is a very old policy in Canada?—A. Yes.

Q. You know that?—A. Yes.

Q. And that it is quite possible that the state of affairs you suggest might have existed for possibly a long while; possibly not in the same number, but a number of French Canadian priests were employed, particularly in connection with French Canadian work?—A. Yes.

Q. That is, the repatriation of French Canadians from the United States?—A. That is what they were paid for, but I make the statement that they were not using all their time for that purpose.

Q. I understood that, but I thought really the thing you were dwelling on was the difference in religion, or the disparity in the employment of the various denominations. Is that the thing you are emphasizing?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever get a return with regard to the staff of the Department, inside and out, of what number were of the various denominations?—A. Well, this copy of Hansard is the result of the question.

Q. But, as to the staff of the Department?—A. No, we are not concerned with that.

Q. What is the question which is asked there, to which that was a reply?—A. "Return to an Order of the House of Commons, dated February 24th, 1927."

Q. Asking for what?—A. Asking for: "The names, salaries, and expenses of all clergy, indicating denominations, employed by the Government in immigration work in Canada, in the United States, in Great Britain and Ireland, and on the continent of Europe."

Q. Were you instrumental in having the question asked?—A. No.

Q. Do you not think that before you could make a fair criticism in reference to this, you ought to have the figures, showing the employment, by denominations in the Department, not only clergymen, but all the staff?—A. No, I think that comes under the heading of Civil Service, does it not?

Q. Yes?—A. This is special agents employed for outside work.

Q. Does it say special agents? I thought it said clergy?—A. These are not workers in the office.

Q. What is the thing asked for again?—A. "The names, salaries, and expenses of all clergy, indicating denominations, employed by the Government in immigration work."

Q. In immigration work, that is not special work at all; but would we not get a fair view of the way the Department deals with this denominational matter by having a return showing all the denominations on the staff, both inside and out? Would not that be fair?—A. We are not a bit concerned with who is employed in office work. We do not want to make this religious distinction.

Q. I thought you were particularly concerned, or some one is, with who is employed by the Deputy Minister. I thought that was the whole point?—A. Only as to the one, the Bishop believes is responsible for that telegram.

Q. What do you mean? The telegram showing the funds had run out?—A. Yes.

Q. But I thought you were specially concerned with the fact that there should be another deputy minister, just because that telegram was sent?—A. I never said anything at all about the Deputy Minister.

Q. Are you making that your own?—A. No, I submit that as the Bishop's evidence.

Q. You are not making that your own?—A. No.

Q. Do you know whether Bishop Lloyd has ever taken the trouble to ascertain the relative number of the various denominations employed in the inside and outside services by the Department, and the relative number of immigrants brought in according to denominations? Have you ever made that study?—A. No, and I hope I never will. I do not think that we should go to any Department of this Government, that is, a Civil Service Department, and say, "Now, there are so many of one church, and so many of another." They are employed, not from their church point of view, but as citizens.

Q. I think, with all respect, Canon Burd, that you protest a little too much when you bring up statements of this kind, directed solely to the clergy, and having to do with a special service which has been in use in this country for a great many years, and which has been carried on by all Governments.—A. I still maintain that it is fit and proper to bring that up.

Q. You take the responsibility?—A. I certainly do, And, I am sorry that I am restricted in what I can say.

Q. You have even mentioned what some one has suspected there, so that it is plain that you are not restricted. I never heard evidence of that kind given before?—A. May I ask a question of the Minister of Immigration.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

WITNESS: At the time of the General Synod, Mr. Forke, did you know that these Roman Catholic priests were being used to transfer French Canadians from Quebec to the Western provinces?

[Canon W. Burd.]

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I have no proof of that. I do not know yet, as a matter of fact. I have no proof whatever, of that being carried on. It may or may not be.

Canon BURD: Was it your opinion at the time?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I do not know that. I am not prepared to say. I do not want to keep back anything at all, but what I was dissatisfied with was that they were not doing enough work in regard to bringing back French Canadians from the United States. That is the reason they were discontinued in that work.

WITNESS: And is it true that their services have been discontinued?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I will make it plain. I was not satisfied that those men were bringing back sufficient French Canadians from the United States to Canada to warrant continuing them any longer in the service, and so I dispensed with their services. That is the statement. That was over five or six months ago.

WITNESS: May I ask another question, Mr. Chairman?

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. May I ask you first if you knew that?—A. Yes.

Q. You knew that they had been dispensed with, five or six months ago?—A. Yes, and that is my next point. The moment I heard that those priests had been dispensed with on the ground that they were not efficiently carrying out the work that they were appointed for—I believe I am correct there—I said to somebody in my study—

Q. Do not tell us what you said in your study?—A. My statement to someone in my study was this: "that that would be made up in some other way," and I find within two months' time a grant of \$50,000, is made to the province of Quebec for the repatriation of French Canadians.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: May I make another explanation here, Mr. Chairman? That offer has been made to the province of Quebec, and is made to every other province in the Dominion of Canada.

WITNESS: I have here the minutes of the Social Service Council on the repatriation of French Canadians.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Did you know that?—A. No, I did not. I wish to say this, on the repatriation of French Canadians, the minutes of the Social Council from our church show that the general secretary reported that a repatriation scheme of an additional grant of \$50,000 from the Federal Government had been accepted by the Provincial Government of Quebec. In response to a letter of inquiry whether Ontario would take up such a plan for the repatriation of English-speaking Canadians in the United States, the Hon. Mr. Ferguson, Premier of Ontario, replied: "All I have seen of a government subsidy for repatriation is in the newspapers." So it had not been made to Ontario at the time it was made to Quebec.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Oh, yes.

WITNESS: Then he continues that he will ask the Department to communicate with Ottawa on the subject, and he says: "You may rest assured if it is possible for the Province of Ontario to avail itself of this subsidy, with advantage to Ontario, we will do so." That offer having been made to Quebec, in order to be fair, it had to be made to all the other provinces.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: We made the same offer to all the provinces. All I say is that we make the same offer to all the provinces of the Dominion, put-

[Canon W. Burd.]

ting them exactly on the same footing as Quebec. If the province of Ontario wishes to go into this arrangement in order to repatriate Canadians from the United States, we will give dollar for dollar with them as we are doing with Quebec. The Minister of Agriculture had been in communication with the department over the matter.

WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Forke. And may I ask how many of the provinces have accepted that?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: None to date, except Quebec, I think.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Is your objection to the engagement of ministers and priests to do this work? Or is your objection on the ground that there were not as many protestant ministers engaged as Roman Catholic priests?—A. Not as many. But there was this distinction made that there was no difficulty in those twenty-nine Roman Catholic priests being employed, but when we were definitely promised assistance for two of ours, expenses only, that promise was not fulfilled.

Q. Would you have been satisfied if protestant ministers had been engaged in equal numbers?—A. We do not ask for that at all.

Q. Would you have made any objection if there had been as many protestant ministers engaged in this work as Roman Catholic priests?—A. I think it would be altogether a wrong way to work, to do that.

Q. I do not think that is just an answer to my question, Canon?—A. Well, I am sure that if the Department had employed twenty-five protestant clergymen, then the general public would have said that was fair; there would have been no discrimination; it would have avoided that criticism. But, whether it would be a wise policy or not is another matter.

Q. You would have been satisfied?—A. Quite. I would have been satisfied that the Department was fair, because there are plenty of protestant Canadians in the States that need depatriating, the same as the Roman Catholics. Now, I have here two pieces of evidence, Mr. Chairman, and I hope Mr. Forke will be able to make this clear, because it does seem to carry injustice to these two men.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Mr. Chairman, let us have this last point quite clear? Is it your opinion that these Roman Catholic priests were so appointed on account of the fact that Mr. Egan happened to be the Deputy Minister?—A. No, I do not say that.

Q. You are not saying that at all?—A. No.

Q. Was the reference in the letter from Bishop Lloyd to Mr. Egan one that you want to apply to the employment of Roman Catholics?—A. No.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): Will the Minister say that if an equal amount is offered to each of the provinces at the same time for repatriation purposes, why the Government did not keep it in their own hands, as it is a national affair, and not provincial?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I do not know whether I should answer that or not.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think questions should be addressed to the Minister, while we are hearing a witness.

Mr. ANDERSON (Halton): The Minister was making a statement.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: He was making a statement in response to a question.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Have you finished with this denominational question?—A. Yes. This still bears on that section, dealing with the question.

[Canon W. Burd.]

Q. And the complaint is that up to five months ago they had twenty-nine priests employed, and two others of other denominations?—A. Yes.

Q. That was the point?—A. And that when we applied for assistance we were promised that assistance, and then it was refused.

Q. Is not the real complaint that the man was not appointed that you asked for?—A. Quite.

Q. Do you agree with the system of employing these men for repatriation?—A. No.

Q. You differ with all the governments?—A. I think the moment that they put their duty into the hands of any section, then they are asking for trouble.

Q. Are they not already co-operating with the various denominations?—A. It should not be left to denominations.

Q. Are they not already co-operating with other denominations?—A. They are.

Q. And utilizing that connection that each denomination has with its particular adherents, for the purpose of forwarding colonization work?—A. They are doing that.

Q. Is that a sound policy?—A. I am not prepared to discuss that; I would rather discuss it at the end of my evidence.

Q. Can you give us any opinion now?—A. No.

Q. You have no opinion?—A. Not now.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. A moment ago you gave me the answer that you would have been satisfied if an equal number of Protestant ministers had been engaged, while, to the Minister of Defence you have just said that you do not approve of this system of appointments?—A. Excuse me, I am sorry I did not make myself clear. I said that if there had been twenty-five Protestant clergy employed I would have been satisfied that it was fair but whether it was a wise policy or not, I think is another matter.

By Mr. Dubuc:

Q. Did you make a request that Church of England Ministers be employed in this work?—A. We made a request for the expenses only, and it was not obtainable.

Q. For repatriation work?—A. No.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. The statement was made that the clergy from the province of Quebec had been transporting French Canadians from Quebec to Saskatchewan; what is your proof for that?—A. I will submit my proof to the Chairman, but it is confidential.

Q. I think we should have proof for a statement like that.—A. Mr. Chairman, would you mind reading that? May I proceed in the meantime? I have a letter here from the Department of Immigration and Colonization at Ottawa.

Q. We should have that question answered, and we should have the evidence as to who made this statement.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The Canon just said that he made it.

The WITNESS: The Chairman is reading the evidence, and it will come back again.

The CHAIRMAN: Canon Burd says that he has information which is confidential. I do not think that you can ask him to put it on the record.

Mr. McMILLAN: If the information is confidential, the statement should not appear if we have no reason for it. If we have no proof, then the statement should not appear on the record.

[Canon W. Burd.]

The WITNESS: I have the proof; it is in the hands of the Chairman. I am quite willing for the Chairman to read it, but I cannot give confidential information to the Committee. I had better withdraw the whole thing.

Mr. McMILLAN: It is only right to ask that the whole thing should be struck out, if we do not have the proof of the statement as well.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Could you not give the name to the Chairman? We will call any witness that can prove this, if you will just give the name to the Chairman. He can appear as a witness. We are only too happy to do that, but you cannot simply come here and say, "I have confidential evidence of so and so," and then say, that you will not tell us who gave you that confidential evidence. It leaves it rather up in the air.—A. My point is this, gentlemen; the evidence is there in a confidential letter from one of the officials of our Church.

Q. You should not use a confidential letter.—A. I am not using that as evidence.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. You made a statement, which you claim is confidential. We wish the proof of that statement, and you say you cannot give it to us.—A. Under the circumstances, I will withdraw that statement, so far as the evidence is concerned, and state that it was my belief.

Q. We would like to know on what ground you base your belief. To come forward and say that it is your belief, there should surely be some reason?—A. Well, I gave two lines of reasoning. One was that certain people had gone to the office of the Roman Catholic priest in Montreal, and had obtained the information themselves.

Q. Do you know that of your own knowledge?—A. I have it from my Bishop, who obtained the information.

Q. You are only telling us hearsay, it is not your own knowledge?—A. Quite.

Mr. MCPHEE: The press of Canada is represented here, and Canon Burd's statement has gone out, that these priests, employed by the Department, have been engaged in certain work other than that for which they were employed. When he made that statement he must have known that he could not use the confidential evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: Canon Burd cannot withdraw anything that has been taken down for the record, but the Committee can pass a motion that the evidence on that part should be stricken out.

Mr. MCPHEE: Unless Canon Burd can substantiate the statement by his own knowledge, he has no right to give any confidential information without naming the informant, so that this Committee can call that person.

The WITNESS: I will withdraw that section altogether.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: It has gone out half an hour ago, and we cannot withdraw it. I would say that the only thing left to do is for you to put yourself in the hands of the Committee, and the Committee will say whether we will respect your confidence or not.

Mr. SPOTTON: That seems rather funny reasoning to be presented by the counsel for the Department. Canon Burd gave this as his considered opinion, from what he had in his hand.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): He is not the counsel of the Department.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that statement should be withdrawn.

[Canon W. Burd.]

Mr. SPOTTON: Canon Burd gave that as his considered opinion, from what he had in his hand. He did not state that it was true, but he gave it as his considered opinion. A man cannot always give a reason for a belief, and we never asked the other witnesses for such a statement. It is his considered opinion. It may be right or wrong, but from the information he had in his hand he gave it as his considered opinion, and I think it should be allowed to go as that. If you want to strike this out after, strike it out, but in the meantime I think he should be allowed to proceed.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I am going to ask my hon. friend to withdraw that statement as to my being the counsel for the Department.

Mr. SPOTTON: If there is any reflection, Mr. Chairman,—

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: There certainly is a reflection, and my hon. friend knows it.

Mr. SPOTTON: I am not familiar with the rules of the House, or of the Committee, but since the hon. gentleman was here, and taking such an active part in questioning the witnesses, I did not mean any offense in the matter. I thought perhaps that he was here in that capacity, but if he is not I withdraw it absolutely.

Mr. McPHEE: I think Canon Burd should make the statement that he has no personal knowledge of the statement which he made. If he quoted from a confidential communication, he had no right to make that statement.

Mr. McGIBBON: Surely that is going too far, to say that a man has no right to make a statement. We have had witnesses here who gave their opinions

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: They gave their opinion as to questions of policy, not on questions of fact. As to whether or not these men did or did not do their work, is a matter of proof, and Canon Burd does not help us very much by saying that he believes or does not believe that they did their work. What we want is some evidence about it.

Mr. McGIBBON: It is just in line with what everybody else said.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I do feel that the Committee is entitled to that evidence. I feel that he is in the hands of the Committee.

The WITNESS: I do not want to embarrass any member of this Government, and I will take steps to see that what is now confidential will become non-confidential, and the statement will be made. It is my own conviction that the statement I made is true, but I have no proof that I can give to you now. I will get that proof and we will have it quoted later.

Mr. McGIBBON: Let it go as it is at present.

Mr. McMILLAN: He says it is without proof.

WITNESS: Without proof that I can submit, yes.

I have a letter from the Département of Immigration and Colonization, Ottawa, dated July 11, 1927, addressed to John C. Wakefield, Leask, Saskatchewan. Leask is close to Prince Albert, where I live, and this was brought in to me by someone from Leask. (Reads):—

In connection with the nomination you made on behalf of William Springthorpe, I may say that we have been advised by cable from our London office that the application has been rejected on medical grounds. Persons desirous of migrating to Canada, whether they are assisted or not, must comply with all features of the health regulations. We may receive a further report giving more information, and if circumstances are such as would enable the Department to render further assistance we will gladly do so.

Yours truly,

(Signed) W. R. Little,

Commissioner of Colonization.

[Canon W. Burd.]

The nomination was made by Wakefield of William Springthorpe in England. He promised him permanent employment, and good wages. William Springthorpe went to the Canadian Government doctor, and the doctor did not give him any indication that he was medically unfit; the first intimation was from Canada House.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Who said that the doctor did not give him any information?—A. The man himself. I have the certificate of the man's own doctor. He went to his own doctor, Doctor Parker of Nottingham, on August 5th.

Q. I thought you said that the doctor who examined him did not give him any idea that he was physically unfit?—A. Yes.

Q. Where did you get that from?—A. That is the man's own statement.

Q. Have you that here?—A. I have evidence of it.

Q. Do you not see that you are doing the same thing?—A. I am quite willing to put that in writing and sign it.

Q. That does not help. You were not there, and you are trying a Canadian doctor who is over on the other side, and who is not here to defend himself. You are simply trying him on your own say so, and I would ask you not to make those statements of fact unless you have some evidence of them.—A. I have the evidence of his own doctor.

Q. Of whose doctor?—A. The doctor of William Springthorpe.

Q. That does not prove what the Canadian doctor said.—A. I am leaving that point.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Will you give me the file number of that letter?—A. No. 298715. Surely, Mr. Chairman, some part of this must be taken on my word. I have the doctor's certificate in my hand, and we must assume that he went to the doctor to get that certificate. Dr. Parker of Nottingham is his own family doctor, and this is the certificate. (Reads):

This is to certify that I have to-day examined William Springthorpe and find him to be in good health and of sound constitution. He is fit to emigrate.

(Signed) H. G. Parker,
M. B., Ch. B.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. What is the date of that?—A. August 5, 1927.

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. Have you the date when the man was examined?—A. August 5th.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. 1927?—A. 1927.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. What time was he examined by the other doctor?—A. I have the time here as July 11, 1927. That man paid his own passage out. He is out here now, but he had to pay his own passage to this country.

Q. Was he examined by his own doctor?—A. His own statement was that it was the Canadian Government doctor.

Q. Can you tell me whether it was a statement by the Canadian doctor or the English Roster doctor?

Mr. MCGIBBON: Are you going to give evidence?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I was not going to give evidence, I was asking the Canon.

Mr. SANDERSON: The point is that it was not satisfactory.

WITNESS: That is what the man evidently understood. It was a doctor appointed by the Canadian government, for him to be examined by. He could not be examined by his own private doctor. I think I am correct in that.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You say he is here now?—A. Yes, and he paid his own passage out.

Q. You mean Mr. Springthorpe?—A. Yes.

Q. Where is he now?—A. At Leask, Saskatchewan.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Do you know the time he came out?—A. Shortly after the letter was written; I do not know the exact time.

Q. Do you know whether he had any medical examination by the port doctor?—A. He passed through the regular channels, and no exception was taken to him.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You do not know the exact date he arrived?—A. No, but it was some time last fall. The point is that this man was turned down when he applied for an assisted passage, but when he paid his own passage he was passed as fit.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. Do you know whether the examination is the same for an assisted passage, as when they pay their own passage; take a person coming out from Great Britain.

The CHAIRMAN: That is hardly a proper question to address to this witness.

WITNESS: Might I say that the letter states that persons desirous of emigrating to Canada, whether they are assisted or not, must comply with the medical regulations.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Was it brought to the attention of the Department in the way you state it?—A. It was brought to the attention of the Department by the man himself, at Canada House.

Q. After he came?—A. When he was there.

Q. But has the case been brought to the attention of the Department?—A. Not until now.

Q. Not to your knowledge?—A. No.

Q. How long have you known of it?—A. Several months.

Q. You did not drop a note to the Department pointing out the inconsistency of the regulations or of the examination?—A. No. For this reason that the man himself complained, but could receive no satisfaction anywhere.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Did he pass these documents on to you?—A. No, his clergyman passed them on to me.

By Mr. McPhee:

Q. Have you any personal knowledge of it?—A. From the man himself?

[Canon W. Burd.]

Q. That the man complained to the Department?—A. No, I have not, from the man himself.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. One medical man might say that he was sick and another that he was well?—A. That is what happened.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. We are trying to improve the situation a little. Do you not think it would have been fair to the Department and to the Immigration administration that when a case of that kind came to your attention you should drop a note to us and say, here is some inconsistency, and suggest that the work of the doctors be co-ordinated; would that not be a fair thing to do?—A. Well, I have a great deal to do out there; I have a huge parish to attend to. His own minister informed me that he had done what he could.

Q. I think you said he had worked in England?—A. Yes, when he got to Leask his Minister brought all the papers in for me to see.

Q. Why did he bring them in to you? Why did you not bring the matter up?—A. It is not my place to bring up every individual case to the Department. It was brought up at Canada House, in England.

Mr. BROWN: A case of this kind, as well as others that might be cited, might indicate that Canada is not favourable to Immigration, that restrictions are put on; that would be the effect of a case of this kind and others that have been brought before us.

Mr. DONNELLY: He is laying a charge against the doctor that the man was turned down without knowing the history.

WITNESS: I am not doing that.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Can you tell the Committee the time that elapsed between the two occasions upon which this individual applied for medical examination?—A. The letter will give the date, approximately. The notification that he was turned down was received by cable on July 11th, and an August 5th of the same year he was examined by the other doctor.

Mr. COOTE: To enable the Committee to get that, it should be pointed out that this man was examined by a doctor in the Old Country when he applied for an assisted passage, and when he paid his own passage he was examined on this side. I think it should be pointed out that the examination given to him when he got off the boat could not be as thorough as when they examine emigrants in England. I think that might explain why this man might not be passed in England, but on the examination at Quebec or some port on this side he might get by the more hurried medical examination. I think that probably will explain the case.

WITNESS: That is a matter that should be investigated. If he is medically unfit he should be deported, and if he is medically fit he should have his passage refunded to him.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Is this man working on a farm now?—A. To the best of my knowledge and belief, he is.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Has he ever asked for a refund?—A. No.

[Canon W. Burd.]

Q. To your own knowledge he has never asked the Minister?—A. Not to my knowledge. I have had another case of a similar character given to me. The other is here in a statement which is not signed by the man himself; it is a certified copy of what occurred, by myself. I give the facts. Mr. Sparrow, an ex-British Sergeant Major, his wife, two boys of farm age, and one girl of school age, all apparently in good health, applied in the spring of 1927 to be accepted under the three thousand family scheme, and in preparation for this he informed me that he had taken a certain amount of farm training, that is, he got a job on a farm and did a certain amount of farm work, but was not farm-trained. The application was rejected as being unsuitable under the three thousand family scheme. The action taken was that both boys were accepted by the Ontario Government and were brought out under their scheme. The man paid his own passage out, to Canada, got a job on a farm up near Prince Albert, and the farmer told me that his services were acceptable. The Soldiers Settlement Board certified that the man was capable of working his own farm. He allotted one half of his pension in order to purchase a farm, so that the man's pension is reduced by one half to enable him to purchase his farm. The result is that the father is in Saskatchewan, the two boys are in Ontario, the mother and the girl are in England, and the family is split up. The man has the approval of the Soldier Settlement Board, and as his wife and children have now been nominated it is the hope that the whole family will soon be reunited.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Do you think that would be enough information for the Department?—A. The Soldier Settlement Board at Prince Albert will give all the particulars. These are two instances that have come to me without my searching for them. It is reasonable to suppose that they are not the only ones. All these things make it difficult for settlers to come out.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: The officials over there have to make some estimate of the capabilities of men who come here to take up farming and get a loan of \$1,500. In doing so, it is quite possible that they may make mistakes. I do not see anything very serious in what you mention. Apparently the officials did not think they were fit, or that they were the kind of people they would grant a loan of \$1,500 to, to pay for a farm in twenty-five years. It was a matter of opinion; they may have made a mistake, but there is nothing serious in the charge, that I can see.

Mr. CAHAN: In order to clear this up, the Department should present to the Committee the results of the examinations made of these two individuals in England. I would make a formal motion, but it will be done, I have no doubt.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Can you give any further information to the Committee?—A. No.

Q. Is it the first time you have taken this up?—A. Yes. I had no idea that I would be before this Committee. I have just taken this opportunity of bringing them before the Department.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Have you another individual case?—A. No. I have not. These are the only two. I have something to say also about the actual conditions in the West. I have not touched upon that yet.

The Committee adjourned until four o'clock.

The Committee resumed at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: Order gentlemen, the Committee will resume.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Chairman, there were a couple of cases mentioned while Canon Burd was here this morning. I know that he and the Committee both would like to have further information about it. These are individual cases, and I know that Canon Burd would like to have whatever information there is on the departmental file about it?

Canon BURD: Yes.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: In order that it may be cleared up if possible, there was the case of that man named Springthorpe, whom you remember was said to be refused by the Roster Doctor in England when he applied for assisted passage, but who afterwards came over here and was apparently passed on this side at Quebec. The departmental records are as Canon Burd has pointed out, a letter stating that he was not physically fit, and as follows (Reads):—

26th April, 1928.

MEMORANDUM

In the matter of a complaint by Canon Burd in connection with the nomination of William Springthorpe by John C. Wakefield of Leask, Sask.

The nomination was received in the Department of the 4th of June, 1927, and transmitted to London on the 7th of June, 1927. On the 7th of July a cable was received to the effect that William Springthorpe had been rejected upon a medical certificate. On the 11th of July Mr. Wakefield was advised as follows:—

In connection with the nomination you made on behalf of William Springthorpe, I may say that we have been advised by cable from our London office that the application has been rejected on medical grounds. Persons desirous of migrating to Canada, whether they are assisted or not, must comply with all features of the health regulations. We may receive a further report giving more information and if circumstances are such as would enable the Department to render further assistance we will gladly do so.

Under date of the 22nd of July the following report was received from Assistant Director of Emigration in London:—

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

19. S. 3612

CANADA

THE CANADIAN BUILDING, TRAFALGAR SQUARE,
LONDON, S.W. 1, 8th July, 1927.

DEAR SIR,—Referring to your File No. 298715 regarding nomination of William Springthorpe.

Our Medical Adviser reports in this case that Springthorpe is certifiable under Sec. 3, ss. (c) of the Immigration Act as he has valvular disease of the heart, as evidenced by a mitral systolic murmur and hypertrophy of the heart; blindness of the left eye and defective vision of the right eye which is only 6/24ths normal. Further, the applicant is stated to be of a weak constitution and he would consider him a very poor risk and does not recommend his emigration to Canada. In view of this report I have cabled you, as follows:—

298715 Springthorpe medically rejected.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) ANDREW N. O'KELLY,

Assistant Director.

Of course, all the Department are doing is to report what they have from the medical director on the other side.

Mr. CAHAN: The Departmental records should be accepted.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I have here a record of the examination of Springthorpe, when he applied to get in himself. Under the assisted passage he had to show that he was an agricultural worker, or came under the domestic service class. He arrived at Quebec on August 27, 1927. His present occupation is shown as packing-case maker, and when he was asked if he was physically defective his answer was "No". That is the same man who was examined by the Roster Doctor, and in whom was apparently found these defects.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Just for the purpose of getting information. Mr. Egan tells me that he was trying to look up this record of a telegram, or something, sent to the Bishop advising him that there were no funds available in connection with the appointment of representatives of the Anglican Church?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you give us the date a little more closely, as to the date when his lordship sailed?—A. I have only that letter to go on that I handed in as evidence. It was in the fall of 1925, and I believe he mentions the month in the letter.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why should the Minister of National Defence take up the task of defending the Minister of Immigration?

The CHAIRMAN: Are you objecting to the Minister of National Defence speaking? He is a member of the Committee.

Mr. ARTHURS: No, not at all, but why should he take up the defence of the Minister of Immigration?

The CHAIRMAN: There is no question of defence that I can see.

The WITNESS: I am sorry to have kept you so long, gentlemen, but the fault has not been entirely my own. This is the last section, and I think it will be fairly brief. I am confining myself, almost entirely, to official figures. This deals with the present situation in the Western provinces, and the cause for our very deep alarm as to whether the present policy is going to be detrimental to Canadian interests. You are familiar, I suppose, with the official figures published for the fiscal year 1928, ending March 31 last? You will have noted that the immigration to Canada amounts to 151,537, which is an increase in British immigration of 1,088. There was increase in immigration from the United States of 3,982, and from other countries, an increase of 2,536.

A division having been called in the House, the Committee adjourned.

The Committee having resumed:

WITNESS: I have just quoted the figures of the immigration for this last year, pointing out that there had been a small increase in British of 1,088, a larger increase of non-British, Europeans, of 2,530, and a still larger increase of immigrants from the United States, 3,892.

The figures for March this year are these: There have been 14,665 immigrants that have come into this country, that is, at the end of March, 1928. Of these, 3,150 are British or 22 per cent of the whole. There are 4,379 so-called preferred Europeans. Take those from the remainder, and it still leaves 4,753 non-preferred Europeans compared with 3,150 British.

Now, it has been the habit to take the British, and add to that number those from the United States, and add to the number of that those from preferred European countries, and say, "Now look, there are many more of those than

there are of non-preferred Europeans." I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that that is not a fair way to deal with those figures. The immigration from the United States should not be classed as British.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: The Immigration Department does not do that.

WITNESS: No, I do not say the Immigration Department does that, but it is done in certain quarters. Those figures have been added. My contention is that immigrants from the United States should be classed almost as neutral.

In 1926-27 the official figures were 21,000 immigrants from the United States. We must not imagine that these immigrants are all of British sentiment, because 9,956 of them are of foreign extraction; practically half of those that come in from the United States are of foreign extraction and the remainder, we could not call them British in sentiment while some of them may be.

If we have many of the Bill Thompson of Chicago type coming in, you can quite understand they are not very keen on the British Empire. And so I feel we should leave the United States figures out entirely. That means we have to deal entirely with the British and non-British from Europe, and in the month of March, we had 3,750 British compared with 9,832 non British from Europe, almost three to one.

Another point, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make is this that while those figures are bad—I think we can all agree they are not desirable—yet by the time they get to the West, they are a great deal worse. The reason for that is that Ontario has its own Immigration Department in England, and it secures a large percentage of the British Immigration for Ontario. These figures I secured from the Ontario Government yesterday. In 1926, to March 31, the total number of immigrants coming to Ontario, was 33,293, and of these no less than 21,000 were British. Taking that 21,000 from the small amount of British coming into the country you can readily see that the further the trains go West the less British you find. And so we find this happening at the present time in Winnipeg. The Canadian National Railways in Winnipeg very kindly allowed me to have the figures for all immigration which has passed through their hands in Winnipeg this year, that is, the immigration into Winnipeg, and the immigration passing further into the West. They had a total of 11,000 which have passed through on their lines as immigrants.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. How many?—A. 11,000, and of that 11,000 some 2,500 are British, and 8,500 non-British, and of those non-British 70 per cent are central and Southern Europeans. The C.P.R. would not give me any figures. They said they had instructions from Montreal not to give any figures at all, and that I would have to apply to Montreal for their figures. It seems to be a general rule and was not any discrimination on the part of Mr. Van Scoy of Winnipeg. But I found in the newspaper that same day "C.P.R. Bringing Many Settlers Next Week. Approximately 2,000 immigrants will arrive in West over Railway's lines." And of that 2,000 one hundred and seventy were British.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Did you apply to Montreal?—A. No, I came straight through to Ottawa from the West.

Mr. CAHAN: The evidence of the witness so far as he has gone is no doubt very interesting, but we are entering now upon an argument which has nothing to do with the facts, and I think that the witness should suggest to us what the purpose of his argument is. The facts are available to us as well as to him.

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, my purpose in bringing these figures before the Committee is to show that the present system is detrimental to us who are

[Canon W. Burd.]

living in the West, and I think it is quite in order for me to give the figures of those immigrants who are now coming in to the West.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. In what respect?—A. In order to show that the proportion of those coming into the West are largely non-British.

Q. It would be interesting to us to know how that could be obviated?—A. May I continue with my evidence along this line, Mr. Chairman? I have now in my hand the provincial census of Saskatchewan, census for 1926, published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and I take it that the figures of the Bureau of Statistics are correct. I wish to show from this that the percentage of British in Saskatchewan, is steadily decreasing.

On page 81 we find that in 1916 the proportion of British in Saskatchewan was 54.8. Five years later, in 1921, the proportion of British in Saskatchewan was 52.8. Five years later the proportion of British in Saskatchewan had dropped to 50.7 per cent.

From the same Journal page 158, I find the percentage of British that has entered Saskatchewan each year is given, and I will give you those years. In 1921, the percentage of British immigration of the total immigration coming into the province was 46.3.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Percentages do not tell us very much unless we have an idea of volume. Have you the number there?—A. I have the number.

Q. Just give it to us in thousands?—A. In 1921, 5,741 came in, and 46 per cent of those were British. In 1922, 4,119 came in, and 40 per cent of those were British. In 1923, 7,523 came in, and 31 per cent of those were British. You will notice the British is coming down all the time. In 1924, 7,834 came in, and of those 30 per cent were British. In 1925, 7,615 came in—and that is the last full year we have—and of those, 26.72 per cent were British.

Now, gentlemen, do you think that we are unnecessarily alarmed when we say that the proportion of British immigrants coming into our province, or coming into the West is not enough. In the last year, that is, the last full year, 26 per cent were British, and 73.28 per cent were non-British.

Q. What is the population?—A. I do not know what the population is.

Q. You said something about 50 per cent there?—A. 50 per cent of the total population?

Q. I know, but what is that?—A. I do not know the exact figures.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Might I ask the witness, does he regard it as deplorable that the British are in the minority, and would he have the whole of the prairie provinces awaiting the income of British settlers, who apparently are very reluctant to come and settle in this country?—A. So far as that question is concerned, I know that we in the West have no desire to restrict the West to British immigration, but we do feel that when it is down to 26 per cent British, and most of those who are coming in are non-preferred Europeans, it is not a desirable thing.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: 26 per cent British only represents about 2,500 people in 870,000, it is only about 7,500 altogether per year.

WITNESS: May I remind the Committee again that the total percentage of British in the whole of the province with its population of 800,000, or whatever it is, has decreased from 54 per cent to 50 per cent. The trend is downward.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. When you say 54 per cent, just what do you include? When you speak of the percentage of British in the province, do you include only those born in the British Isles, or do you include those and their descendants?—A. Whatever their origin is.

By Mr. Dubuc:

Q. Are French Canadians counted as British in your figures?—A. I do not know. That is a matter that could be investigated.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: The population of Saskatchewan is 821,042.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. That is a provincial census, is it not?—A. Yes.

Q. A census taken by the provincial authorities?—A. Yes. Perhaps some of you could tell me whether that is under the provincial authority or the Dominion Government, it is published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Mr. BOYS: That is a quinquennial census taken under Dominion legislation. The provinces have a census taken every ten years, and the Dominion have one every ten years. They alternate, and in that case you have a census every five years.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. What page is that?—A. Page 81 for the whole of the province, and page 158 showing the proportion of immigration into the province.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Would you restrict the continental element coming in to keep them down to a certain percentage of British immigration?—A. Yes, I certainly would.

Q. Even if a larger number of people were required for the population of the country?—A. There is one point I want to make in a few moments, and it is this, that these men are not all going onto the land.

Q. Well, we will be very glad to hear evidence on that point?—A. Now, one can talk most about the district one lives in, and here I have first-hand information. The City of Prince Albert, in the north of the province, is in the centre of a large agricultural district. To the east is a very large British settlement, the Carrot River Valley, and when people talk to you about the British people not being able to go into the back-woods, and carve out a homestead, I would point out to you that that Carrot River Valley to-day is one of the most fertile in Western Canada, and 25 years ago, it was solid bush. Those people went in there, cut down the trees, and they have prospered. Instead of having such British settlers, lately we have been having a very large percentage of undesirable foreign settlers. By "undesirable" I mean those whom the Dominion government has classed as undesirable by calling them "non-preferred Europeans". The following figures were taken from Immigration Hall at Prince Albert, and are official. In 1927, 964 immigrants entered Prince Albert for distribution in the district. 147 of them were British; 40 Scandinavians, and all the rest—over 700—were non-preferred Europeans. Those men apparently came out under nomination. I do not know who brought them out. I do know they came to Prince Albert. I know a great many of them had no work to go to when they came. The agent there did his best and he shipped these men to the lumber camps, to the railway gangs and to the road gangs, but not to agricultural work, and these men apparently had no agricultural jobs to go to. From the 1st of March until the 21st of April 228 immigrants entered Immigration Hall. Of those 228 only 17 were British, 1 Dane, 1 German, and all the rest non-preferred Europeans. I went into the Hall and found those

men starving. I could not speak their language, but the keeper interpreted and said they had been promised work and good money, and when they got to Prince Albert there was no work and no money. I took money out of my own pocket to buy bread for these men. They were absolutely destitute, no money and no work, and these men are the ones they say are needed.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Do you know who brought them in?—A. I do not know. They came in on the C.N.R., because that is the only railway which enters Prince Albert.

When I reached Saskatoon on my way down here I found another carload waiting to go to Prince Albert of that same type of settler. I say there is something wrong. I cannot place my finger on it, but it is work which this Committee could very well investigate, as to why these men are being brought in and are displacing our own British people.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Can you tell us how many went on the land last year out of the number you have mentioned?—A. No. I have a letter here from the War Veterans' Association of Prince Albert addressed to the Premier, dated April 18, 1928, which reads:—

At a regular meeting of the Prince Albert branch of the Canadian Legion, British Empire Service League, held on April 17, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:—

That a Committee be appointed to draft a protest to the government against the large number of non-preferred European immigrants entering this district.

In accordance with this resolution the Committee has obtained the following information from the official records. In 1927, 964 immigrants arrived at the two Immigration Halls in Prince Albert; over 800 were foreign and only 40 preferred Europeans.

(b) From March 1, 1928, to April 18—

That is a lesser period than the one I have just quoted—

One hundred and eighty-eight have arrived and of these only 17 were British, the remainder being non-preferred Europeans. These men have been promised farm employment but it is found they are accepting other positions in the city at a low rate of wages, thus aggravating the present unemployment problem.

That is signed by Mr. A. D. Gordon, Secretary of the Special Committee. When I arrived in Winnipeg I found that, what is given in this account (indicating), 2,000 unemployed were parading in Winnipeg, most of them of the same type of foreigner.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I was informed by a Conservative Member of the Federal Parliament, who was there and saw the parade, that there were about 300.

The WITNESS: I am going on the newspaper account.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Did you make any inquiries at Prince Albert as to who had signed the nominations for these men to come in?—A. I understood they came in under the C.N.R. Colonization Board, but as I have no definite proof for that, I would not like to give that as evidence.

Q. Have you made any representations to the Colonization Board with respect to the non-employment in this way?—A. No, but I understand that the

Mayor of Winnipeg has wired to Ottawa in connection with the other situation. I was told that when I was in Winnipeg. Now, the same thing apparently is going on in the Peace River district. I have here a letter from Rev. H. Quartermaine, who is a rural dean of the Peace River district. As such, he is responsible for a larger territory than his own parish, taking in two or three thousand square miles. In that letter, a part of which only I will quote, as the rest is personal, he says:—

Every incoming train—we have two each week—brings its contribution of new settlers of every nationality except the British. There are comparatively few of the latter, until this grand Peace River country is fast becoming a hodge-podge of foreign-born peoples who never will become loyal Canadians imbued with the traditions of our British-born.

Q. From your experience in the west, do you not think that is a rather broad assumption for you to make?—A. I am quite sure of this, that if the present proportion which is coming into Prince Albert is maintained, they never will be. It is not fair to them to bring them into an environment which is not sufficiently loyal to start with.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Reverting to an answer you gave previously, giving the percentage of British in Saskatchewan, and those who are non-British: you are including, I suppose, as non-British those who were born of foreign parentage ten or fifteen or twenty years ago?—A. Yes, that is the racial origin quoted in that census.

By Mr. Caham:

Q. Could you tell us from your experience whether or not the children of the second generation become Canadians, whether British or not?—A. In some cases they do. Where they are separated from their own groups they do, very rapidly, but where you have them segregated into blocks—and I have in my hand a map showing what the Soldier Settlement Board called a “foreign block”—you will see when they get into the middle of one of these blocks there is not much chance of their becoming Canadianized. This (indicating) is the diocese of Saskatchewan, constituting the northern part of the province. I checked this up at Winnipeg with Major Giles, and he said that it was correct, and the Honourable Mr. Forke has, I believe, seen the rest of the provinces and they look much the same as a patchwork quilt of foreign settlements.

By Mr. McPhee:

Q. Do you mean to seriously state that these people from Central Europe who live in blocks, as you say, are not loyal Canadians, and that their children have not become assimilated with Canadians?—A. In a number of cases, I do.

Mr. MCPHEE: I want to tell you, if you seriously make that statement, that as far as the district I represent is concerned, that is a libel on the district.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. How long have you been in western Canada?—A. Fifteen years.

Q. I would like you to state specifically if you are acquainted with the village of Osler, the village of Hague, and the village of Warmouth? Are you familiar with the population of those villages?—A. Only in so far as I have passed through them.

Q. Are you familiar with the people living there?—A. No.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): They are largely people who have come from other lands. I have the honour to represent that portion of Saskatchewan, and I think

I know these men fairly intimately and fairly well, and I would like to state here that I have found them amongst the best Canadians that I have found anywhere. I myself was born in Canada, my racial origin was Scotch, and I think no man questions my loyalty to this country, and I regret sincerely the statement which Canon Burd has made. If he does not know these people, as he now says he does not, I think it is a very unfair statement to make to this Committee.

THE WITNESS: May I support that by evidence from Magistrate Brown of Saskatoon? I did not say every district, but I do say that in a number of cases where they are segregated into foreign blocks that is the result. It is far easier to become assimilated when mixed with Canadian people. Magistrate Brown says this—and surely a magistrate of Saskatoon has some idea of what he is talking about,—

We are not making very much progress, are we, in the education of these people in Canada, Police Magistrate Brown observed, when glaring instances of illiteracy came to light in police court this morning during the preliminary trial of Mrs. Lena Nawalkowsky charged with shoplifting. Mrs. Antonio Ruminisky, a friend of the accused, came from Austria to this province twenty years ago, and could not speak English when called to the witness stand. "She had come to Rosthern district," she said—that is the district which has been mentioned—"and was the mother of eleven children. She had arrived here as a girl of seven and had never been to school." The accused woman was born in Canada, and has nine children. She also has not been to school, and her knowledge of English is limited.

Then the statement goes on and brings in more along that line, so I have some ground for what I say. I do not say it is the same in every district.

MR. VALLANCE: I should like to ask Canon Burd if he would expect as an Englishman, or if I as a Scot, coming to this country,—if we would expect to be classed as immigrants? I never was in the immigrant hall, and returning from England I can speak of those who came over with me at Easter and there were many English and Scotch on the train newcomers to Canada who were not known as immigrants. They were travelling the same as we would and were looked upon as ordinary passengers, and would not come through the Immigration Hall. Do you think that your figures are right in that respect? If not, it is giving a false impression to say all went through that channel?

THE WITNESS: May I make it quite clear that I have purposely added to the figures of the British those who did not go through the Immigration Hall. We meet all the British that come in, and in order to be quite fair I added those to the figures and it brings it up to the number of 17, those that did not come through that Hall. The Soldiers Settlement Board has told me that last year they had 75 English families apportioned to them for the Prince Albert Land District, which is a large district. This year the number is down to 25. So you see they are not British people that come in.

HON. MR. FORKE: That does not prove anything.

By Mr. Anderson:

Q. Will you tell me what district this map represents?—**A.** It represents the northern half of Saskatchewan taken from some 20 miles south of Saskatoon up north and the whole of the province from east to west.

Q. Would you pass that map around, Canon?—**A.** Yes, certainly. There are two of them. That has been verified by the Soldier Settlement Board in Winnipeg on my way through.

[Canon W. Burd.]

By Mr. Boulanger:

Q. On this map will you tell me whether the French people are included in the settlements marked by black dots?—A. I have tried to find that out from the French districts. The settlement of Arborfield is a solid French settlement and is not marked black on that map. Whether the other French districts are or not I cannot say.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I have given the last of my evidence. That is the last of the figures I have to offer in support of my statement that we are getting too many non-preferred Europeans in the west, especially in Saskatchewan, in proportion to the number of British. And as we read the papers we find that the prospect is that we will get more from non-British European countries. This is from the *London Observer*:—

One of the most able Canadians domiciled in Germany, Professor Louis Hamilton, of the Berlin University, has completed a brochure and a film which is going through Germany giving the advantages of Canada. There seems to be no reason why the Canadian-German population, at present estimated at about half a million, should not increase suddenly by leaps and bounds.

I have here a picture of the leader of the Doukhobors, Peter Verigin, leader of all the Doukhobors in Canada. He was in Winnipeg last week—this was before Christmas I believe—

working out plans which include the bringing of 15,000 immigrants from Russia to Saskatchewan next spring.

The Vice Consul of Poland, in Montreal, declares that 26,000 Poles will be coming to the Dominion this year.

Carl Schultz of Walberg brings out 20 Germans, goes back for 100 more and says,—

Thousands of young Germans are turning their eyes towards Canada.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Do you regard that as deplorable that immigrants are coming in from Germany? What better class of people could we find if the British will not come?—A. I challenge the statement, Mr. Chairman, that the British will not come, and I speak to this Committee from my knowledge of Canada. (I came here fifteen years ago) and my knowledge of England is considerable. Although it is not the land of my birth, it is a land in which I spent a great many years. There are thousands of British to-day of good virile stock, who are not farmers, yet who are willing to farm if the opportunity were given. Before the war the rate was so low that it was almost as low as the assisted passage is to-day. It was practically what we would call now an assisted passage. I am convinced that if that rate were down to pre-war level and those men could come out as they did before the war, when we had our bumper immigration from England, without these restrictions, and give them a chance to make good, they will make good to-day as the Premier of Alberta made good.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Will you state what restrictions there are, if any, and what we have done that we should not have done?—A. The restriction is the assisted passage scheme as it is at present.

Q. We put no restriction on a man who wants to come.—A. No, but the fare is a restriction which has gone up to about twice what it was before the war. Some of our finest citizens in Western Canada to-day were immigrants

[Canon W. Burd.]

from England. The Premier of Alberta; Seegar Wheeler, called the Wheat King; the Hill Brothers of Lloydminster, sons of an Army sergeant-major; the Mayor of Tisdale—all green Englishmen who came out without experience and have made good.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Do not forget the former premier of Saskatchewan.

The WITNESS: Yes, I thank you. I feel this very strongly, Mr. Chairman, but perhaps I should not say it, because it is in the line of a suggestion, and perhaps this is not the time to bring it forward.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: We want suggestions.

The WITNESS: I do not wish to offer suggestions that have not been well considered and based on complete information. The work of this Committee is, I take it, to get all the facts, and then to work out the best solution.

A MEMBER: To get the facts and also any suggestions that may be offered.

The WITNESS: Then one of my suggestions is this and I leave it with you for what it is worth. The British Government voted 90 million dollars, or we will speak of pounds if you like. They voted 18 million pounds to spend on this work. They have only been able to spend three and a half millions of that. They are willing to put up much more than they have already spent, and I am quite certain that if it was made perfectly clear in England that we want British settlers here whether they have worked on the land or not, the British Government would put its hand down deep into its pocket, without it costing Canada a penny, to see that these men are brought here and also to see that they are established. I believe with good will and understanding a scheme like that could be worked out.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. What have we done that we should not have done?

The WITNESS: I think I have shown that.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. As I understand you, Canon Burd, your investigation shows that the percentage of the British-born population of Canada has been steadily declining for perhaps the last 20 years, and that something should be done if possible to avoid a continuance of that decline or otherwise it will not be long until the percentage of British in Saskatchewan will be less than fifty per cent.—A. Quite so.

Q. Since I have been in the room, I gather that that is one of the points you want to leave with the Committee. Am I right?—A. Quite correct.

Q. Then did I understand that the figures you have quoted were collected during the last 20 years?—A. No, the figures I have quoted were for the last five years—or ten years rather.

Q. You say the figures are for the last ten years?—A. Yes.

Q. Then you make the further point that you believe that if the proper thing, whatever it may be, is done, we can secure for Canada a greater percentage of British immigration?—A. I am convinced of it.

Q. And that you think something should be done to check the foreign immigration when it is not suitable for agriculture, because when they come out what they do is to displace Canadian labour.—A. Quite so; I thank you.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Would you favour as far as the West is concerned a quota law for undesirable Europeans?—A. I would. I would advocate a quota law being established at once and stop the stream before the condition gets worse, until a proper plan for settlement can be worked out. The longer we delay stopping

that stream, the more difficult it will be to rectify matters, and that was the resolution of our Synod.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Is it as easy to settle the Britisher to-day as it was at that time, before the war? Do you really think it is, taking everything into consideration that has happened over there since that time?—A. So far as my knowledge goes, I see no difference. The British people have not changed to that extent. The younger generation has just as much grit in it as it had in the past. We hear people talking about the dole over there; that is not the right name for it. They have it in Austria-Hungary as well as in England. The dole is simply unemployment insurance.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. A man has to contribute to it?—A. Quite.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. My experience with the foreign born, especially those who were born in Canada, is quite different from yours. Of those born of foreign parentage in Canada, would you like to say what percentage could be considered as loyal Canadians?—A. I could not say.

Q. According to your statement a little while ago, it would be very small?—A. One of the tests would be to take the time when war was declared, and find what proportion of British blood enlisted, and what proportion of non-British blood enlisted. If you had those figures you would have some idea of what the practical patriotism is.

Mr. McINTOSH: I am not a member of this Committee, but I would like to ask the privilege of asking a question.

Some Hon. MEMBER: Agreed to.

By Mr. McIntosh:

Q. What proportion of those who have come to Canada, whom you named as foreigners, have been made British during the last twenty-five years, or do you still consider them all as foreigners?—A. What do you mean by being made British?

Q. Assimilation to Canadian and British institutions, from the standpoint of doing their part in the development of Canada?—A. I could not say.

Q. I think that is a very important point.—A. I have no means of knowing that unless I intimately knew everyone of these districts.

Q. I take it for granted that you feel that some of them have been assimilated?—A. Certainly.

Q. Your parentage would move downward? You are not making any estimate for those who have been thoroughly assimilated? I do not think that is fair to our alien settlements, as you call them?—A. Do I take it that you would be quite satisfied for this present proportion to continue?

Q. Personally, I am not the slightest bit afraid of the future of Saskatchewan with respect to the numbers we are getting now, and I think I am just as loyal a Canadian and Britisher as you have here, or can get any place.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. You said that there was a feeling in the Old Country that Canada did not want settlers. What has caused this feeling?—A. I do not know.

Q. Do you think that feeling is there?—A. I am sure that feeling exists. The extracts that I gave from the Hansard of the British House of Commons show that it is there, and we must recognize that it is there, whether rightly or wrongly.

Mr. MCGIBBON: Surely we did not bring this man here to put him on the rack? He has made his statement, and if we do not believe it we do not have to, but I do not think that this Committee should follow a course of cross-questioning, and make the witness produce documents to prove everything he has stated. He has stated his own opinion, and I do not think that we should treat him any differently from any other witness. It seems to me that he has been more or less persecuted in this Committee all day.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. You brought up one case this morning of a man named Springthorpe; do you know the gentleman?—A. No.

Q. Have you ever seen him?—A. No.

Q. The medical report states that he had valvular disease of the heart, as evidenced by a mitral systolic murmur and hypertrophy of the heart; blindness of the left eye, and defective vision of the right eye which is only six-twenty-fourths normal. In view of this medical evidence, would you suggest that he was a man that should come in under the assisted passage?—A. If that is correct, I should like to know what the medical officer was doing at the port of entry, when he let that man through, if he was blind in one eye and could hardly see out of the other.

Q. I am asking you the question that if this is the fact, do you think that that man should be brought in under the assisted passage?—A. I think, if that is correct, that he should not. However, against that, we have another doctor's certificate to say that he is in perfectly good health. There should be an investigation.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. Is it not much more likely that a doctor would be more or less lenient in passing a man, than to over-emphasize a man's disability? Are not the probabilities in favour of this being correct, rather than the other?—A. When I am informed that a man is on a farm and doing farm work apparently quite satisfactorily, I would say that it is a matter for investigation.

Q. In view of the statement very widely circulated, that Canada is discriminating against British immigrants, would not that be based on the fact that we are trying to help these people?—A. May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that I brought these cases as two specific cases. I also quoted from the member of the British House of Commons, who made the statement that there was discrimination.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Do you not think that this discrimination, or this idea of discrimination has crept in through a man like this, after being turned down by the doctor, going out and saying that Canada does not want men? We are helping these people as much as we can?—A. I think that is really a matter for an investigation. We cannot make snap judgments as to whether it is true or not. When Sir N. Moore stands up in the British House of Commons and says that time after time he has sent men, and there has always been delay and excuses, it shows that it is not a question of one case here or one case there. It is a matter of general policy that should be seriously investigated, because the thing does exist.

[Canon W. Burd.]

By Mr. McPhee:

Q. Have you a copy of that map, Canon Burd?—A. No, I have not.

The CHAIRMAN: It is in the hands of the Committee.

By Mr. McPhee:

Q. You held up a map showing foreign districts in your diocese; is that right?—A. Yes.

Q. And you tried to show the preponderance of foreign over British stock?—A. Yes.

Q. On this map, if you will read it, you will find that there are nine or ten French colonies included in this block map which you have here. Now, I will read them, and this must have been known to you, or you should not have read it.

Pre St. Marie, French; St. Brioux, French; Domremy, French; Duck Lake, French; Albertville, French; Debden, French; Marcelin, French; Alberttown, French; Vawn, French; and Paradise Hills, French. You would not class those French colonies as foreign colonies, would you?

Mr. BOULANGER: You mean French-Canadian?

Mr. MCPHEE: Certainly. They are included in this list as foreign settlements.

WITNESS: While these are printed at the bottom of this map, so far as I know they were not marked black. Arborfield is not marked black, and it is a solid French settlement. I take it for granted that there are others that are not marked black.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Who prepared this map?—A. I am not at liberty to say who prepared it, as it might get somebody into trouble.

By Mr. McPhee:

Q. It says: "The portions of the map in black indicate districts in which colonies or various nationalities preponderate over British stock in the diocese of Saskatchewan. The northern and unsurveyed section of the diocese (not shown on the map) is wholly Indian in character. This variety of settlement is evidenced in all the western dioceses." Then we have "Settlements of foreign extraction in the diocese of Saskatchewan: location, nationality." There are thirty-one of them altogether given on the map as black, and one-third of those are French settlements.

The WITNESS: May I repeat again that that list does not tally with the black parts. Evidently the person who made it—I do not know who prepared the map in its present form, that is, putting the names underneath—got a list of all the settlements and put them underneath, because the map is not numbered where I saw settlements. Pré Ste. Marie, the one that is marked underneath, is certainly not marked black on this map, because I know Pré Ste. Marie very well.

Mr. BOYS: What has this to do with the question, Mr. Chairman? As I understand it, what the witness is stating to the Committee is that the British are decreasing. He does not give any opinion about it, but he quotes from the census. I take it for granted that any foreigner, who was such when he came here but had become naturalized, would not be classed in among these foreigners.

Mr. TORZKE: I am classed as a German, in that section. I claim that I am as loyal a British subject as any Canadian.

Mr. BOYS: I do not doubt that for one moment. Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. I would like to understand this. Do I understand, then, that in the

[Canon W. Burd.]

sense in which this has been referred to that even supposing a man has been here thirty years and has been naturalized for twenty or twenty-five years he is put down as a foreigner? If that is so I think the sooner the Committee get busy and see that the census of Saskatchewan is not taken on that basis, the better.

Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYS: As soon as a man becomes naturalized, I certainly think he should be classed as a Canadian. I think what we had better do is, to try and find out for certain what the correct figures are. I do not think it makes much difference what is shown on black in the map; what the witness is trying to make out is that where the population of a district is largely foreign, a man is not going to be in a hurry to learn English, and I do not think there is a man here who will not agree with that statement. I am not casting any reflection upon anybody when I say that if I went to a foreign country and found myself surrounded by those who spoke another language I would certainly try and adjust myself to that condition.

An Hon. MEMBER: They do try to learn English.

Mr. BOYS: I would be surprised if that were so. It is not so with the French, and it is not so with the Germans, and it is not so with the Hebrews in this country. They want to talk in their own language in their own homes; that is common sense. Perhaps the hon. member wants to create a disturbance in this Committee, for some reason which I do not wish to mention here. Canon Burd was asked a question and he made the statement that when these people are found in groups of their own people they are not going to be assimilated, and that is about all he said. That is the outstanding fact.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): He said they never would be.

Mr. BOYS: He never said that.

The WITNESS: I never said that.

Mr. BOYS: He never said that, in my presence. A statement of that kind is only made to cover some ulterior purpose.

Mr. MCPHEE: When I interrupted, I interrupted to say that as a matter of fact one third of these districts marked in black are French.

Mr. BOYS: What I want to say in conclusion is that the impression left on me, rightly or wrongly, is that the British population of Saskatchewan is constantly decreasing. The question before this Committee is, should we or should we not try to stop that and maintain Saskatchewan as a British province in Canada?

Mr. MCINTOSH: Mr. Boys, when you say the British population is decreasing in Canada, do you include French settlers?

Mr. BOYS: I certainly do.

Mr. MCINTOSH: I would not have thought so, from what you said.

Mr. BOYS: That is your stupidity. I have many French in my own town. The point is, let us get the facts. Are the facts as the witness has stated? If they are desirable, let us continue them, if not, let this Committee try to work out some scheme which will improve conditions.

Mr. McLEAN (Melfort): I would like to make a brief statement. I want to say that this gentleman comes from the constituency I have the honour to represent. He has settlements marked as of foreign extraction. This line running here (indicating on map) consists almost entirely of English speaking people, English speaking Scandinavians, very many of them from the old country, many of them from the United States. All that the witness says is this, that he has not checked them over. The district of Prince Albert is one of the very,

[Canon W. Burd.]

finest in western Canada. Pré Ste. Marie is a settlement of French-Canadians; many of them came back from the eastern States to Canada approximately fifteen or twenty years ago, and most of them are English speaking. Farther west there is a settlement of the same nature; many of the inhabitants came from the United States, many of them from Manitoba to Saskatchewan. Farther along there is the settlement of St. Brieux, marked in black on the map as being French and Italian. I do not personally know of any Italians in the district, but there may be an odd Italian. The settlement is French and French-Canadian, some from Normandy, some from Brittany. Where they are marked black they are almost entirely of foreign origin three or four generations back. These are largely of foreign descent. I think it is very unfair to have this map passed around as evidence.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. In regard to British immigration and assisted passages, is it your opinion that we should extend that to all Britishers who are willing to come to Canada, rather than to confine it as at present to the agricultural classes?—A. Yes, that was one general suggestion I made, that if the cost of passage was down to what it was before the war we would probably have a similar proportion coming out to this country.

Q. That is not what I want to get at, because we have this difficulty you have just mentioned now, that there is a surplus in the unemployed labour market at Winnipeg; they may be foreign born, but the fact remains that there are not positions for them, they are not employed. Having had to do with immigration for two or three years I realise some of the difficulties, and I think this is something that would help the Committee. If assisted passages were given indiscriminately to all Britishers who are willing to come, then we must assume that those who are coming at the present time by assisted passages are coming to occupations other than agriculture. We have that problem on our hands all the time. Bearing in mind that we are not, as far as we can control them, bringing foreigners in who are not going on the land, what I want to get your idea upon is, if we extend it to all Britishers who are willing to come, irrespective of occupational test, we will have a large proportion of our people going into the cities the same as the foreigners are doing to-day.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would like to ask the witness whether he would not think the returns of 1926, the census giving the figures for Saskatchewan, would not be more correct in the matter of determining the proportion of British to foreign born in that province? Let me again quote; in the year 1916, the number of Canadian born was given as 352,920, British born 93,712, foreign born 201,203; in other words, the proportion of Canadian and British born to foreign born was four to two. There were almost half as many foreign born as British born. The situation was pretty serious, but let us see what has happened in the meantime. In 1921 the number of Canadian born is given as 457,833, British born 100,355, and foreign born 199,322. In 1926, Canadian born 525,372, British born 99,176, and foreign born 196,190; in other words, according to the figures of 1926, the proportion is six to one. From 1916 I am not concerned with the government in power at that time, when the proportion was two to four but the proportion of foreign born has decreased until it is now only two in six.

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is a very fair way of stating the case, for this reason, that this woman I have just quoted in the Saskatoon Police Court, who was born in Canada, and cannot speak English, having brought up a family of children, is classed as British born under this category. It does not indicate at all the racial origin.

[Canon W. Burd.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, May 1, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Before we commence hearing witnesses, Mr. Chairman, I have a wire here from the United Farmers of Canada, Saskatchewan Section, signed by J. A. Stoneman, president, reading as follows:—

“ A. G. MACG. YOUNG, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Hon. George Langley, who was in Great Britain with Canadian National Farmers' party, took occasion to refer at Forum meeting, Regina, to hampering regulations in connection with securing British immigrants and has first hand information regarding immigration matters which should be heard by the Immigration Committee (Stop). Could you see that Mr. Langley be summoned to appear before the Committee?

UNITED FARMERS OF CANADA, LIMITED

(Signed) J. A. STONEMAN,
President.”

I think this Committee has suggested already the calling of a representative from the United Farmers of Canada, for the three sections, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and inasmuch as the president has asked that Mr. Langley be summoned, I would suggest that we ask him to come and represent that body, as suggested here.

The CHAIRMAN: Which body is that, Mr. Young?

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): The United Farmers of Canada, Saskatchewan Section.

Mr. BROWN: I want it to be clearly understood that the farmers' organizations of Manitoba and Alberta are not the United Farmers of Canada. The United Farmers of Manitoba and the United Farmers of Alberta are the correct designations of those farmers' organizations.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I am not concerned with that; all I am concerned with is this telegram. Anyway, those are the real farmers of Saskatchewan. This wire suggests the calling of Mr. Langley, and I do not think it is necessary to make any motion in the matter. The Committee has by resolution decided to ask the United Farmers of the Saskatchewan section to send a representative, and this is the representative they want to send.

(Agreed to.)

The CHAIRMAN: We have to-day Sir Joseph Flavelle, Canon Vernon and Miss Childs. I am going to ask Canon Vernon to take the stand first, as he is very anxious to leave for the Maritime Provinces. May I suggest to the Committee that in view of the fact that we have three witnesses to-day, the questions put to them shall be on a line with the remarks they make, otherwise that the questions shall be short and as much to the point as possible. I believe Canon Vernon has a statement to make, and he will then be very glad to answer any questions that may be put to him.

Canon C. W. VERNON called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. Proceed, Canon Vernon.—A. Mr. Chairman, I prepared this brief statement in order that I might be as clear as possible, and in order that I might save the valuable time of the Committee. I am glad, even at the expense of cancelling at the last moment important engagements in the Maritime Provinces, to accept an invitation to appear before this Committee. My position for the last nine years has been that of General Secretary of the Council for Social Service of the Church of England in Canada, the Official Board charged by the General Synod with this work for the welcome and welfare of the newcomers, and its immigrant work generally.

Early in the winter I discussed the question as to the advisability of the Church of England being represented before this Committee with Archbishop Matheson, who is Primate of the Church of England in Canada.

I am glad, even at the expense of cancelling at the last moment several important engagements in the Maritime Provinces, to accept the invitation to appear before this Committee.

My position (for the past nine years) is that of General Secretary of the Council for Social Service of the Church of England in Canada, the official board charged by the General Synod of the Church with its work for the welcome and welfare of the newcomer and its immigration work generally.

Early in the winter I discussed the question of the Church of England being represented before this Committee with His Grace, the Archbishop of Rupert's Land, the Primate of the Church of England in Canada. His Grace decided that if an invitation should be sent to the Church by the Committee, I should appear before you. When the invitation came to me I wired his Grace; I received the reply "Go, certainly."

The Anglican Church has for many years been actively engaged in welcome and welfare work for the newcomer from other lands. It was, I believe, the first religious Communion to place chaplains on immigrant-bearing ships and at the Atlantic ports in Canada. This was done by the English Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, at the suggestion of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. This chaplaincy work at Quebec, Saint John and Halifax, aided of late years by welcome and welfare deaconesses, is now maintained, directed and financed by the Council for Social Service.

Our chaplains and their helpers are at the ports to welcome, aid and advise new comers and to distribute the names and Canadian addresses of all Anglican newcomers to our clergy throughout Canada. For the years ending December 31, 1927, over 24,000 such names and addresses were dealt with.

Our welcome and welfare work has been largely extended through work at our Council's office and through welcome and welfare workers and voluntary Committees throughout Canada.

Gradually the recognition of the fact that much more might be done for our own migrants and the desire to aid in promoting the migration of suitable people of British stock to Canada led us to take up aggressive work for the recruiting of suitable settlers in the British Isles and for their placement in Canada under the auspices of the Church.

This work was carried on for some time in co-operation with a number of voluntary societies of the Church in England, especially the Church Army and the Church Emigration Society.

In 1925 partly at the suggestion of our General Synod and of the Council, which I represent, the National Assembly of the Church in England established the Church of England Council of Empire Settlement, of which the

[Canon Vernon.]

Archbishop of Canterbury and York are the Presidents, Earl Jellicoe, Chairman, and Sir George MacMunn, Organizing Director, to act officially for the Church in the Motherland in Empire Settlement work and to co-ordinate the work of the voluntary emigration societies of the Church. Our Council is their Canadian representative, and they act for us in Great Britain.

What the Church of England in Canada is now doing.—The present work of the Anglican Church in Canada includes:—

1. Welcome and Welfare Work at the Ports.
2. Welcome and welfare work in other parts of Canada.
3. Securing through the clergy nominations for single men, single women, and families.
4. The maintenance of Church Hostels for Boys for the reception and placement of British lads on farms.

The Church of England now has five such Hostels,

1. The Gibbs Home, Sherbrooke, founded a long while back and still maintained by a Church Society in England.
2. The Church Army Hostel, Winnipeg, opened in 1925.
3. The Church Hostel for Boys, Edmonton, opened in the spring of 1926 and maintained by this Council.
4. The Church Hostel for Boys, Melfort, Sask. opened in the spring of 1927 and maintained by this Council.
5. The Brasseay Hostel, Indian Head, Sask. just opened by this Council in the old Episcopal residence given to the Diocese of Qu'Appelle by the late Lord Brasseay, whose daughter Her Excellency Lady Willingdon headed the subscription list for restoring and furnishing the building.

Other Organizations seeking to promote British Migration to Canada.—It is interesting to note that the Church of England does not stand alone in recognizing the need of actively promoting British Immigration to Canada. The British Immigration and Colonization Society, the British Settlement Society, the British Welcome and Welfare League, the I.O.D.E., the Y.M.C.A., the United Church, and latterly the Orange Order and the Navy League of Canada are all similarly engaged.

What the General Synod did last September.—The General Synod in considering the section of the report on Immigration of the Council for Social Service, debated the Immigration problem very fully. It should be borne in mind that opinions expressed by individual members of the Synod (as is the case also with Parliament) do not become the official utterances of Synod unless crystallized in a resolution adopted by both the Upper and the Lower House of the Synod. What the Synod actually did was to adopt the report of the Council to be found in the Journal of Synod pages 268 to 282 and to pass in the order named the three following resolutions:—

1. *Suggested Conference to Promote Preferential British Immigration to Canada.*—Moved by the Bishop of Toronto, seconded by Canon Vernon and resolved:

“The General Synod desires to pledge the co-operation of the Church of England in Canada, through its Council for Social Service and its British Representatives the Church of England Council of Empire Settlement, in the matter of preferential British migration to Canada, and at the same time to urge the calling together by the Government of Canada at the earliest possible opportunity of a conference representing the Dominion and Provincial Governments, the Churches, all voluntary organizations interested in immigration and the transportation companies to discuss the practical details involved in carrying out a still more extended policy of preferential British Immigration, and to secure the fullest possible co-operation of all concerned.”

[Canon Vernon.]

2. *Quota Policy Advocated.*—Moved by the Bishop of Saskatchewan, seconded by the Bishop of Toronto, and resolved “The General Synod of the Church of England in Canada, recognizing the vital need of maintaining our British connection, our British ideals and our British institutions and believing that the preponderance of continental over British immigration to Canada is likely seriously to lower existing standards of wages and living conditions, the maintenance of which is in the best interest alike of the foreign born and of those of British stock, desires to urge upon the Government of Canada the adoption of a quota policy to limit the number of certain classes of foreign born immigrants admitted during any year to not more than 50 per cent of the British born admitted during the preceding year.”

3. *Delegation to Wait on the Government.*—Moved by Canon Burd, seconded by Dr. A. H. Moore, and resolved “That this General Synod appoint a deputation to wait upon the Government of Canada for the purpose of requesting that equal facilities be granted to the Church of England in Canada in dealing with immigration as are granted to other Christian Communion in Canada.”

These resolutions were in October presented to Hon. Robert Forke at Winnipeg by a delegation appointed and headed by the Primate.

Re Resolution No. 1. Suggested Conference to Promote Preferential British Immigration to Canada.—It should be pointed out that this resolution was along the lines of a memorial presented to Hon. Robert Forke on November 12, 1926, by a delegation representing officially the Anglican, Baptist, Presbyterian and United Churches, the Y.M.C.A., and the British Immigration and Colonization Association. The memorial was as follows:

“To the Honourable Robert Forke, Minister of Immigration, and Members of the Government of Canada:

This delegation, representative of the Anglican, Baptist, Presbyterian and United Churches, the Y.M.C.A., and the British Immigration and Colonization, desires

1. Respectfully to urge upon the Government of Canada the fullest possible development of the policy of preferential British immigration to Canada.

2. To pledge the co-operation of the churches and organizations represented in aiding the Department of Immigration in this matter and in providing for the welcome and welfare of settlers coming to Canada.

3. To ask the Department of Immigration of the Government of Canada to call together at the earliest opportunity a Conference representing the Dominion and Provincial Governments, the Churches, all voluntary organizations interested in immigration and the transportation companies, to discuss the practical details involved in carrying out such a policy, and to secure the fullest co-operation of all interested parties.”

The delegation heartily congratulated the Hon. Robert Forke, himself an immigrant, on his appointment to one of the most important portfolios. The Minister discussed with the delegates many immigration matters and it was felt that this early interview with the new Minister of Immigration would be helpful in encouraging the development of British Migration to Canada.

At Winnipeg, with reference to Resolution No. 1 of the General Synod, Mr. Forke stated that the subject of immigration would occupy an important place on the agenda of the conference between the Dominion and the Provinces in November. He also expressed a desire to meet representatives of the churches and voluntary organizations interested in immigration at Ottawa to confer with him with a view to full co-operation in the securing of British settlers for Canada. The Minister also pointed out the valuable assistance that can be rendered by the churches in developing nominations for British families for land

[Canon Vernon.]

settlement, farm workers, and household workers to receive the assisted passage rate. He mentioned that in the past year over 5,000 Britishers have been thus nominated.

Personally, I believe the Immigration discussion at the Conference between the Provincial and Dominion Governments should be productive of good results, but I still believe the larger conference recommended by the delegation of the Anglican, Baptist, Presbyterian, United Churches, the Y.M.C.A. and the British Immigration and Colonization Society in 1927, and the resolution of the Anglican General Synod is needed. *Indeed it would be well if a permanent voluntary Council on Immigration representing the bodies named in the General Synod resolution were to meet yearly.*

Re Resolution 2.—At Winnipeg with reference to a quota policy to restrict Continental immigration, Mr. Forke did not regard this as possible, but assured the delegation that *his Department would do all in its power to promote British migration and to keep due and proper control over Continental immigration.*

With reference to this subject, His Grace the Primate read a statement carefully prepared by himself. From it I quote the following:—

“ Our first duty is to assure you that there has not been on the part of the Synod or of the Church any intention of attacking or embarrassing the Government of which you are a Minister. The reason that the problem of immigration has been brought up at our various Synods has arisen from the fact that grave anxiety has been produced in the minds of the leaders of the Church as to the undue disproportion in the number of immigrants coming from the British Isles and from certain parts of central Europe. The latest ascertained official figures seem to be as follows:—

1923, Non-British, 22 per cent;	British, 47 per cent;	United States, 31 per cent.
1924, Non-British, 37 per cent;	British 49 per cent;	United States, 14 per cent.
1925, Non-British, 38 per cent;	British, 47 per cent;	United States, 15 per cent.
1926, Non-British, 41 per cent;	British, 39 per cent;	United States, 20 per cent.
1927, Non-British, 50 per cent;	British, 34 per cent;	United States, 16 per cent.

These figures are for the fiscal year ending March 31. For the first four months of the present fiscal year ending July 31 last, a total of 89,722 people had entered Canada as immigrants. Of these the percentage was as follows: Non-British, 52 per cent; British, 36 per cent; United States, 12 per cent.

These records seem to forecast that if incomings continue to proceed on these lines the time is not far distant when peoples of Anglo-Saxon origin will be in the minority and when the dominant proportion will be of a different type. Thoughtful citizens in the Province of Saskatchewan are of the opinion that in that province the percentage of foreign elements is already larger than those of British origin. The question is being asked as to whether this is safe and wholesome for the future of the country. What we desire to impress upon the Government is that some means should be adopted to increase the inflow of settlers from the British Isles and temporarily to arrest that from other parts. What those means should be we are not prepared definitely to recommend. In the neighbouring Republic, where the preponderating proportion in immigration from central Europe has already become a most serious problem, leading statesmen are entertaining grave apprehension as to the outcome for the future. Visitors from the United States who come to our Dominion are loud in their warnings that we should profit by their experience and not flood the country with immi-

grants who will produce the puzzling problem with which they are already confronted. As is well known, they have adopted what is termed the 'quota system' with a view of controlling the character and numbers of immigrants flowing into their country. The suggestion is being made that we should adopt a similar policy and it will be seen from the resolution passed by our General Synod that that policy is endorsed, and our delegation is bringing it before you, as Minister of Immigration, for your consideration".

In the course of his charge to the General Synod, His Grace made the following reference to this subject: "The report of the Social Service Council deals quite elaborately with this subject. It gives in detail the efforts which have been put forth to secure for our Dominion a larger proportion of British settlers. We cannot claim, however, that the result so far has been very encouraging. The record of the past year (1926) shows that out of an inflow of 143,991 migrants, 94,207 are from other countries, and only 49,784 from the British Isles, only a little over one-third. Is this a safe proportion in the kinds of people whom we desire for the well-being of the future of our Dominion? In the light of the records, should we not follow up our endeavours to influence those who direct our immigration policy?"

Passing from the words of His Grace the Primate on this subject, I would respectfully point out that the maintenance of the British connection, British traditions, British institutions and British ideals is as much in the interest of the foreign born new Canadian as of the British subject (whether born in Canada or across the seas). I recognize to the full the fine contributions men of other than the Anglo-Saxon race have made, are making, and will make to this Dominion. I would point out that many of them came to our shores because they believe there is greater real liberty under the Union Jack than anywhere else in the world. In their interest as well as in our own we must keep Canada's outlook British.

As far back as March 10, 1922, a memorial presented to Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, the Prime Minister, by a delegation representing the official boards of the Anglican, Baptist, Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches in Canada named the following General Principles that should be given the admission of immigrants:—

1. Canada needs immigrants.
2. Their source, quality and numbers should be determined from the standpoint of the highest permanent interests of both the immigrant and the nation.
3. Admission should be granted only to classes and kinds of immigrants actually needed, and the *Nation's capacity to incorporate into the body politic should determine the numbers received.*
4. Under the conditions at present prevailing in Canada preference should be given to those suited for and willing to settle on the land, or desirous of entering domestic service.
5. *No more immigration should be admitted than can find steady and useful employment without endangering normal standards of life, labour and wages.*

I was told of a British immigrant who came out the year before, under our auspices, and who was getting \$20 a month. He was satisfied, and his employer was satisfied. He had to leave last spring because of an influx of Continentals that came along, and the farmer was able to get two Continental farm labourers for \$10 a month. No more immigration should be admitted than can find steady and useful employment, without endangering the normal standards of life, labour and wages.

(Reads):

I would point out that *too large an influx of continental migrants does seriously endanger our normal standards of life, labour and wages to the mutual disadvantage of our foreign born newcomers and our own citizens.*

[Canon Vernon.]

The present great stream of continental migrants (apparently as large this year as ever) is undoubtedly very largely due to the quota policy adopted by the United States, those failing to get admission there seeking the relatively open door of Canada. Can we afford to be quota-less?

Resolution 3, was submitted by a Committee to consider a memorial presented to the General Synod by Canon Burd on behalf of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, respecting the large number of Roman Catholic Priests employed or having expenses paid by the Department of Immigration, compared to Ministers of other Churches. I must confess that on the surface it looked as if the Roman Catholic Church was regarded by the Department as almost the State Church of Canada, entitled to special consideration and privileges.

The matter was fully discussed by the General Synod's delegation which met Mr. Forke, at Winnipeg and the delegation received assurances from the Minister which it regarded as satisfactory.

Other Points urged by the General Synod's Delegation to the Minister at Winnipeg, all of which I regard as valuable were:

(a) The extension of the age of teen age boys coming under the Juvenile Scheme to Hostels from the present limit of 14 to 17 to 14 to 20 years of age. We believe that the older lad can be more successfully placed and cared for if placed through a Hostel.

(b) The establishment of a comprehensive Government Scheme for placing inexperienced British families on the land including supervision and advice, and the necessary aid to tide them over their first and if necessary their second year of settlement.

(c) The promise of aid to single men and lads who make good as farm labourers to establish them on farms of their own. This should also be applicable to Canadians desirous of settling on the land.

(d) Further development of the system of testing and training farms in Great Britain so that in most cases young men and boys would come to Canada after being tested as to fitness and after having received some elementary training in farm work on Canadian lines.

Personally, I do not believe that they are going to learn much about farming over there, but I do believe, if we had a lot of these training and testing farms, we would find out the young men who were willing to get up early in the morning and work long hours. Farm life, as you know, possesses a peculiar glamour to the city boy until he gets out for a little while. It is much better that that stage of glamour should be all over before they are finally accepted as settlers in Canada. (Reads):

(e) A large and well-planned effort to bring out and place older girls. Canada unlike Great Britain has more men than women in its population, and the disproportion will be increased if the present emphasis on the migration of young men and boys continues.

I believe that in the prairie provinces there are lots of men who are not going to get married, because there are not enough girls to go around. There are lots of young women over in England, about two million and a half, I believe, in excess of the males, who are not going to get married. It seems to me that the married man is a tremendous asset to any country, and that we want a well-ordered plan to encourage the coming out of more British girls and young women. (Reads):

With reference to these the Minister promised: (1) that the Department would give consideration to raising the age of boys available for the Hostel Scheme to 18; (2) Mr. Forke told the delegation that the assistance to be offered to enable British lads who had made good as farm workers to take up land of their own will be applicable to boys placed through the Church of England

[Canon Vernon.]

Hostels at Winnipeg, Edmonton and Melfort; (3) the Department, Mr. Forke asserted, is doing everything possible to develop family settlement schemes along somewhat similar lines to the existing Family Settlement Scheme.

I would point out that no change has been made with reference to No. 1, and that as regards 2 the failure of the Governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta to date to come into the Scheme has made Mr. Forke's promise to our delegation of no effect for the present at least. One of the weakest points to-day is complete co-operation between the Dominion and Provincial Governments.

I do not blame Mr. Forke for a moment, but I am inclined to blame the system which gave publicity to this scheme before the provinces were all in it. It seems to be that one of the weakest points to-day is the lack of co-operation between the Dominion and Provincial Governments.

We gave publicity to that fact over in England in recruiting the boys, and government circulars gave publicity to it but did not make it clear that it was only applicable to a limited number of provinces, and those chiefly in the east.

"The outstanding need to-day in attracting British immigrants." In discussing this matter with the Primate and outstanding Anglican laymen in the west, we came to the conclusion that the great essential in effecting British settlement of the most desirable type is a land policy which will ensure them land of their own. When homesteads were widely available and the lure of free land was offered, the tide of British immigration was greatest. We must have a really attractive land policy if we are to get British farmers and farm labourers, even in limited numbers. If we are to get other Britishers for land settlement we must make it easy for them, after experience in Canada as farm labourers, to acquire farms of their own. The Three-Thousand-Family-Settlement Scheme wisely recognized the family as the best unit of immigration, but it must be greatly extended if we are to accomplish the desired results. Perhaps the greatest weakness of the Three-Thousand-Family-Settlement Scheme lay in the fact that the farms used were mainly those turned back to the Government by soldier settlers. The government had what looked like a big problem, with a lot of farms on their hands. Sometimes the farms were turned back because the settler would not or could not make good; many times because the farms themselves were poor. The essential need—and I am very strong on this—is a careful and independent soil survey of all farms and vacant lands to be offered to settlers. I am a British immigrant. I came out as a boy of eighteen to Nova Scotia and farmed there for a while and when I read the literature about Canada, rightly or wrongly I was convinced that all between Winnipeg and the Rockies was a solid bed of the richest black loam, which you only had to scratch to get good crops. Everybody who knows anything about the west knows that the west has lots of splendid land—there is a good deal of average land; there is some land upon which the best farmer in the world could never make a living. I do not think people have been intentionally put on poor land, but I think it is a big mistake to let people go on poor land without some warning from some government representative that this farm is a farm perhaps in a dry belt where you get good crops one year and then go five years without a crop, and just as you are ready to dig out along comes another crop, and you become encouraged to carry on a little more. Many of these settlers have been placed on farms which are absolutely impossible as a means of making a livelihood.

May I venture in conclusion to lay before the Committee some constructive suggestions in addition to those included in the resolutions of the General Synod, and the suggestions made by the General Synod's delegation to the Minister? For these I take full responsibility. They are not adopted by the General Synod.

[Canon Vernon.]

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. They are not?—A. They are not; they are simply my own suggestions.

(1) In paying my tribute to the zeal and hard work and the courtesy of the Minister and the officials of the Department of Immigration, let me say that I have never had anything but courtesy, I have never had anything but consideration and I have never had anything but fair play from any one of them, but I should like to say that personally I am of the opinion that the officials are so over-worked with the routine duties of their offices that they have not time enough for the consideration and the development of the large constructive policies. I would like to see every one of them get a bigger salary and have less work to do. Surely, too, there might well be a wider latitude in the administration of existing regulations. Let me give you a concrete instance. I believe that land settlement ought to be interpreted liberally. We had an application from a clergyman along the line of the C.P. Railway in British Columbia where a man wanted to nominate a British family with four children. The man who desired to nominate was a section foreman on the railway and he promised this man work on the railway and he could also take up some land. The reason this section foreman wanted to get this British family with four children was that they had to have twelve children in the district to have a school. He had children and another family had children, and if they could get four more children it would make twelve, and there would be a good school in the district. We were not able to get those people nominated for the assisted passage. I recognize the regulations, but surely that was a case where a family was sure of work, where they would develop a piece of land, and where they would help eight unfortunate children to get the instruction we want them all to get.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Why were they barred?—A. Because they were not land settlers; they were to work on the railway.

(2) The establishment of a permanent non-political commission on immigration with wide powers and an outstanding commissioner at its head. Canada needs an immigration Sir Henry Thornton.

(3) The setting up of a voluntary advisory council on immigration representing the Dominion and provincial governments, the transportation companies, the Churches, all voluntary organizations interested in immigration, the organizations of business men, manufacturers, farmers, and the Trades and Labour Council of Canada.

(4) The formulation and widespread proclamation of a broad, comprehensive and attractive policy of land settlement, calculated to prove without a doubt to Great Britain that Canada is really in earnest in inviting British settlers to our shores. This should include plans for establishing men who made good on farms of their own, for providing cottages for married farm labourers—and I am glad to learn that is under consideration now—for attracting farmers with capital, and for experiments in small community settlements of British people.

(5) I see no objection whatever to the Government co-operating with the government of the province of Quebec in promoting the repatriation of French-Canadians now in the United States. They make some of our best citizens. But this should be accompanied by an equally earnest effort to secure the repatriation of English-speaking Canadians at the present time in the same country and the coming to Canada of other British people now in the United States. For all these colonization rates on the railways should be available.

(6) An increased effort in the direction of the settlement under carefully supervised conditions of older girls and young women from Great Britain.

[Canon Vernon.]

(7) I believe there is a lot in this. A well-thought out plan to secure the establishment of branches of British industries in Canada. Such manufacturers might well bring their own skilled labour and in such cases the assisted passage rates might be made available.

(8) A more enthusiastic policy of publicity along right lines and of recruiting by government representatives in Great Britain. Sometimes it almost looks as if the major part of recruiting was to be left to the transportation companies and the voluntary agencies, while the main job of the Government representatives in Great Britain is to prevent the admission of the unfit. I believe as much as anybody in keeping out the unfit, whether British or not, but I would like to see the proportion brought out under government a little larger, and I would like to see a little more energetic campaign by people over there who really know Canada, and I would like to see greater publicity in the British press. A lot of opposition publicity seems to be to the fore, and a lot of it could be forestalled by the right kind of publicity.

(9) One practical obstacle in the minds of many British would-be migrants is the absence in Canada of that complete social insurance (on a contributory basis covering Old Age Pensions, Widows' Allowances, Sickness and Unemployment insurance, now in vogue in Great Britain. I do not believe in talking about the dole. It is unemployment insurance, and if I were a man in England who had paid in for a long while, into unemployment insurance I naturally would think that would be a factor in deciding whether or not I should come to Canada. I have got life insurance, and one or two of my policies prevent my living in tropical climates. If I were offered a job in a tropical climate, in the interest of my wife, my children and myself I would have to refuse. Possibly the British Government might be induced to continue if needed the unemployment insurance to a settler during his first year in Canada. It seems to be a reasonable proposition. They would not lose anything by it; they would not spend any more than they are spending now, and they could help people over the difficulties of their first winter.

(10) A careful consideration of the problems of the Canadian farmer and of the problems including unemployment of industrial workers in our cities. These have led (1) to the movement from the country to the city, (2) to the exodus from Canada to the U.S.A. The statistics recently published as from the Dominion Statistician would seem to suggest that emigration is perhaps a bigger problem than immigration. If we make Canada so good a land to live in people will want to flock into it, and I believe that will speed up the stream of immigration.

(11) The possibility of getting third-class steamship rates for unassisted immigrants nearer those of pre-war days. The best people often **don't want** assisted passages and cannot easily pay the present rates.

(12) Fuller co-operation between Dominion and provincial governments (this is very important) with representatives from the prairie provinces in Great Britain.

Alberta now has a representative for the prairie provinces, and the uniting together of each of them and putting a representative in London would enable them to have the sort of thing that Mr. Knox, representative of the Ontario government, has, representation in London for his province.

13. The holding of medical examination in the country of origin has been approved over and over again by Church and Social Welfare Organizations. It is to be hoped that it will prove true that the substitution of Canadian doctors in place of the British Panel doctors will not in any case be attended with delay in the examination of would-be migrants, and that the present staff on the Continent (five in number, I believe), will be increased to insure a really thorough physical and mental examination of all continental migrants before leaving for Canada.

Personally, I have asked our own representatives to report to me any case of delay, so that we may send it to the Department at Ottawa. I think if the Government's publicity had been a little more effective, they would have forestalled a lot of the public opposition over there to this.

Now, I realize that on the Continent they are all examined at the port, but I was told by an official the other day that the doctor at Danzig examined, since this came into operation, in the year up to the present, 9,000 continental immigrants and had rejected 4,000 of them. At breakfast this morning I asked a doctor how strict he thought the medical examination ought to be. He thought it ought to be equal to that required for life insurance. I asked him how long it took to examine a man for life insurance. He replied that he imagined that it would take an average of about twenty minutes. I asked him, What do you think the extreme limit of time a medical man should take to conduct a thorough examination of an immigrant whom he has never met before? He said that he thought if a man examined ten immigrants in an hour (six minutes each) he would be doing well, and if he put in seven hours a day, from nine to five, with one hour for lunch, that is about as much as you could expect of him.

You can easily see that while the Department has moved in the right direction, it is in the interest of the immigrant himself. Years and years ago we urged that they should be examined out there, so that we would have done away with this tragedy of people coming to Canada's front door and being turned back because they are not physically fit. I urged that on the Continent, where the doctor does not know the language and where it is not easy to get the family history, that the physical, mental and psychiatric examination should be very strict. Even with assistants, one man cannot put through satisfactorily 9,000 people since the scheme came into operation.

14. A careful survey of the possibility of developing home industries to provide winter employment for those settled on the land, especially where mixed farming does not prevail.

15. The same opportunities that are offered to British settlers to locate on the land should be made available to Canadians. This should tend to relieve congestion in the cities and leave at least some openings for skilled industrial workers from Great Britain.

In closing I should like to emphasize the value of the newcomer to Canada. As a rule they are generally people with vision and forethought enough to seek to better their economic conditions, and to seek the larger opportunities. The old, the infirm, the unambitious, are not likely to be largely represented among them. The fact that most settlers come to us during adolescence or the earlier years of adult life is an economic asset to this country that is too often completely overlooked. It means that the country of origin has borne all the expenses of their youth and of their education and they come to us at the peak of their greatest strength and usefulness.

I thank you very much for hearing me so patiently.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Canon Vernon, you gave certain figures regarding immigration, from year to year?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you give us in those years any figures in reference to the United States; are those given for citizens of the United States, or foreign-born, or were the foreign-born included in the figures for the United States?—A. You mean in the first list from the primate?

Q. You gave from 1924 forward, I think, until the present time?—A. Yes. The first column indicates the non-British. That means, I presume, Continentals. The next column is British, the next is United States. Some of those coming from the United States might be of Continental origin.

[Canon Vernon.]

Q. As a matter of fact they are?—A. Yes.

Q. And they are included in that figure?—A. They are included in the United States figures. I imagine those were worked out from the Government statistics.

Q. My next question is this: you advocate a land survey, and you gave an instance of land taken back from the soldier settlers, some of which land was not really good land, and on which it was not advisable to place families?—A. Yes.

Q. You urged a resurvey of these lands, as to their agricultural value?—A. I went farther than that. I understand there is a resurvey being made. I recommended a soil survey all over the West, and all over Canada if it could be done, so that no settler would be put on land where he could not make a living.

Q. Another question I want to ask is this: Should that survey also be made for Canadians; that is, where a man has a farm, say, in Ontario, and four or five sons, and there is not sufficient land to provide employment for his sons; they are going to other countries or to different places. Should that survey be made applicable to those who desire to go from one of the older provinces to the West, so that they should have the same advantages as the foreigner?—A. Personally I am in favour of every opportunity and every assistance we are giving to the British being given to our own sons and daughters.

Q. My next question is very simple; you gave an instance of a family being refused admission on the recommendation of a railway section man in British Columbia?—A. Yes, because the man was not a farmer or was not about to engage in farming, because the man was going to be employed by a railway company and would be a railway employee. Of course he would be doing farming on the side. It is well sometimes to put the telescope to the blind eye, in immigration matters.

Q. You drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that many men, perhaps from the southern part of Europe, are allowed to come to this country, non-farmers?—A. Yes.

Mr. ARTHURS: Perhaps they are not assisted; perhaps assistance was not granted to that family, but even in that case I believe an exception should be made to the general rule.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. I would like to ask a question with regard to these figures. Saskatchewan was referred to. In the province of Saskatchewan there are many people who have lived there ten, twenty, thirty and upwards of thirty years, who are of foreign-born parentage, and who have located in Canada and are British subjects. Are they classed as non-British?—A. There are two ways in which you can classify people, as to the country of citizenship and as to the country of origin. It seems to me that the country of origin is more important from the biological and ethnological points of view than the country of birth.

Q. Your figures are taken from Dominion statistics?—A. Those of the primate, probably.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Did I make a mistake in understanding you to say that the country of origin was more important than the country of birth?—A. I think it is. If you are considering the making up of the population of the Dominion, the racial origin while you might not agree with me, I think, is of a good deal more importance and more interest than the accident of birth.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. The negro is always a negro?—A. Yes.

[Canon Vernon.]

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. What you have in mind is racial characteristics regardless of the origin?

—A. The problem, I think, is a question of the ability to absorb.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. So it does follow that those I have referred to, who have been born in Canada of parents who are British subjects are still classed as non-British in these figures, the figures you gave of non-British 22 per cent and 47 per cent British?—A. Those are immigration statistics. Those are all new people coming in.

Q. I think not, Canon. You gave in 1923 the non-British at 22 per cent; was not that those who were in Canada?—A. No, those were immigrants coming in.

Q. Then I was wrong?—A. I am sorry.

Q. Another question; reference was made to a British boy or man who had worked here one season and had given satisfaction, then lost his job because the farmer engaged two foreigners or two Continentals at \$10 a month?—A. Yes.

Q. That leaves a wrong impression. I have not found—and I have been living in the West a good many years and have come in contact with Continentals—that they will sell their services for a low price. Occasionally one comes in who cannot speak the English language and cannot even state to the man who employs him what he wants, and he may offer to work for \$20 a month where others work for \$30. If you can find many who will work for \$10 a month, I think I can place them. I think this leaves a wrong impression upon the Committee?—A. This case was quoted to me or told to me the other day. I was reading in the newspapers about the unemployment situation in the city of Winnipeg. Of course it was newspaper talk. It was pointed out that Continentals in the main were in the vast majority of those out of work.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Before we leave that, I had a very interesting experience last year. A lady near Regina wrote me that five Continentals had applied for work at her place, and the only English they could speak was "Fifty dollars," "fifty dollars."

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Many of these things can be ascertained from the evidence already given. I am very anxious to hear what Sir Joseph Flavelle has to say.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I also want to hear Sir Joseph Flavelle, but I should also like to ask the Canon one or two questions that will not take very long. You spoke of your work along juvenile lines, Canon Vernon.

WITNESS: Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Boys of 'teen age?—A. Yes.

Q. I would like to ask you what your procedure is in the Old Country in getting such boys. Is there practically an unlimited number of such boys available in the Old Country, and is there also a demand in the West for such boys to work on farms?—A. Our procedure is to work through the Church of England Council of Empire Settlement. They work through the parish clergy, and through meetings. We have got a representative, a young clergyman from the West, who has had farming experience. He has been over in England, since the beginning of January, engaged in recruiting these boys. We are getting them not from institutions, but from normal homes; boys of fifteen or sixteen who are leaving school. We find it none too easy to get the boys. We have had several parties this spring. We have got a party on the ocean now, coming over to the Brassey Hostel in Saskatchewan. As to placement, we have always had more

[Canon Vernon.]

farmers asking for boys than we have had boys. There is not any difficulty in getting the boys placed on an all-year-round engagement.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. At what average wage?—A. We do not allow any boy to begin under ten dollars a month. They go up afterwards; their pay increases afterwards. At the beginning, we are more concerned to get a boy placed with a farmer who is going to teach the boy, and who is going to be decent to the boy, and give him a good show. We place them with farmers who are recommended by two other people, and by the clergyman of the district, regulated by a superintendent. And if the farmer and the boy do not get on, the boy comes back to the hostel, and is placed out again. We have a savings scheme. Fifty per cent of the boy's wages are paid into the hostel, and banked for the boy. We have boys who came out in 1926 who have three or four hundred dollars in the savings bank.

Q. This question came up before the Committee, and we were advised that previous to placing these boys, the different officers, or those in charge of the bringing in of these boys should personally visit the farmers, rather than visit them afterwards; that is, look into the desirability of the position for the boy, before the boy is placed rather than afterwards?—A. We try to do that as much as we are able to. We are not always able to do it, but all the farmers are recommended by the clergy, and if we find the clergyman is not practical enough in recommending farms, we gradually more or less cut out sending them to that district. As a rule, our superintendents are men who have had quite long experience in farming in the West, and are practical men, and sympathetic with boys. We have had very little difficulty in that way.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): Mr. Chairman, I understand that Canon Vernon represents the Church of England in Canada. Last day we had Canon Burd who said he represented the Bishop of the diocese of Saskatchewan. I do not think it was brought out here, and I would like to ask, for the information of the Committee, if the Diocese of Saskatchewan is co-extensive with the province of Saskatchewan, and if not, what is the proportion?—A. The Diocese of Saskatchewan covers, roughly, the Northern half of the province of Saskatchewan. The Southern half is in the Diocese of Qu'Appelle. The Diocese of Saskatchewan runs—I am not sure of the latitude—somewhere along from Lloydminster, across the province, and away up North. It takes in Saskatoon and Prince Albert. Regina is in the other diocese.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions from Canon Vernon? If not, we thank you very much Canon Vernon, for your assistance.

CANON VERNON: I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Witness retired.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee ready to call Sir Joseph Flavelle? We have still twenty-five minutes.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, there is a matter I would like to bring up before the Committee. I think it will only take a minute or two. A few days ago, on the suggestion of Mr. Garland, the Committee, I think, agreed to call Mr. Caldwell of Regina. Mr. Garland, unfortunately had to leave for the West last night, but he left word for me, asking me to mention the matter in Committee. We are under the impression from what he has learned, that we might secure better information regarding the matter which we had in mind, from Miss Childs, who is Social Welfare Commissioner in Winnipeg. I understand that Miss Childs is in the city, and that it would expedite the work of the Committee and save the expense of bringing Mr. Caldwell from Regina, if we could get the necessary

information from her. Therefore, I would suggest that Miss Childs be asked to attend as a witness in place of Mr. Caldwell. I will move formally to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN: I may say that Mr. Garland spoke to me last Friday about this. He explained that he would not be here to-day, and said he would ask Mr. Coote to bring the matter before the Committee. Is it the pleasure of the Committee to substitute the name of Miss Childs for that of Mr. Caldwell.

Mr. GLEN: Mr. Chairman, I second the motion of Mr. Coote.

The CHAIRMAN: I may say that Miss Childs is at present in the room. Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the motion? I declare the motion carried.

SIR JOSEPH FLAVELLE called and sworn.

The CHAIRMAN: Sir Joseph, this Committee has been appointed to investigate the question of immigration in this country, and they thought you might have some suggestions or some advice which might be helpful to the Committee in their work. Therefore, we asked you to come down, and we shall be very glad to hear anything you have to say to us.

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen: Anything I have to say, I fear, will not have much value to the Committee in matters of detail, or method, or plan. Immigration appeals to me as all problems that I try to have a view about, that spirit is always precedent to method; that the detail in plan or the adoption of method will to no considerable extent be determined, I think, if it is wisely done, by the conception of the operation, by the size and measure of the thing that is to be accomplished, and it has seemed to me in purely personal thinking about immigration—and I need not remind the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that having no public responsibility, I am not embarrassed by the minutes that are put upon public men—I do not say that cynically—in their thinking about a matter with which they have to deal. For governing my own thought, I bring to it just what I would bring to any problem with which I am confronted, in which I always put men before plans, and in which my chief job in life is to find men who can do the job, and give them their head, under reasonable supervision. I presume one of the reasons why you have extended the courtesy of asking me to be here is that, as far as I remember, I think I spoke twice in public, once in 1925 to a body of businessmen in the Northern part of my own city, and more recently to a businessman's club in affiliation with the Conservative Party. In thinking of what I should say before your Committee, last evening I looked up the notes of what I said to the business men in 1925; and I think it covers the spirit and purpose that I have in my thinking about immigration to-day as well as it did in 1925. It was only incidental to an address on the railway question which my business friends asked me to make, and what I read to you now were some of the concluding paragraphs in that address. (Reading)

“In addition to planning employment for our own people we need more people and more work for more people, both East and West, that we may make more extensive use of our over-developed national plant with its heavy overhead. To this end East and West, Capital and Labour, Parliament and People, should work together, charged with the spirit of enterprise and high endeavour in both private and public effort. We must secure immigration. To do so we require resourceful, constructive leadership which will command the subject, command the respect of the country, the co-operation of provincial administrations and other bodies who have a share in the project. Lord Shaw said when here two years ago: ‘After all, Canada is an empty country.’

[Sir Joseph Flavelle.]

May I add: 'an empty country' in which we have a great store of undeveloped wealth in uncultivated lands, in unworked mineral deposits, in forest reservations, and in fish on both coasts and in northern inland waters. To an important degree these resources lie fallow, awaiting directing minds. They call for men, capital, administrative capacity, with devotion to daily duty.

"You are mostly business men. If you had an over-developed plant for your markets, but with an abundance of raw product, and learned that you could secure a market for your finished products, and had ample credit at your disposal, what would you do? If you were worth your salt, you would forthwith organize your operations to take advantage of these opportunities. You would not be deterred by difficulties and new problems. What would be the result if you measured up to your job and did your work well? Reduced costs for overhead, increased work and wages for your men, fairer prices for the consumers, and increased profit for your shareholders. This illustrates the position in Canada in September, 1925. We have an over-developed plant, including railways, for the present volume of business. We have an abundance of raw products in land and sea. We can have domestic and world markets for our finished products. We can command ample capital. What we want is men who can organize our operations and take advantage of our opportunities. Here lies the remedy-in-chief for our economic need. Railways, taxation, agriculture, industrial development, and employment at fair wages, will all yield to administrative capacity instinct with faith, hope, courage, good sense, and enterprise, applied to the development of the resources which are so abundantly possessed.

More work for more people, and more people at work, with more business and more shoulders to bear taxation, and more tonnage for railways, will automatically stop the drain now experienced in annual railway deficits, to formidable proportions. The important factor is capacity in leadership and co-operation in the country which resolutely determines to hold our own people through available occupation and employment, and in equal resolution to command immigration of men and women to occupy and develop this, as yet, empty country. The employment of our own people does not necessarily precede the other effort—indeed, to no small extent, perhaps it is dependent upon increased immigration, which in turn means increased productivity of assets now dormant.

In speaking to the Young Men's Club in Toronto a few months ago, I said:

(Reads)

The emigration of native-born Canadians and the immigration of British-born and of foreigners should command constructive consideration of the highest order, which Canada possesses. There should be no seeking for party advantage. It is a national problem of supreme importance.

It must not be forgotten that this matter of immigration is the movement of men and women in a great adventure. It cannot be wisely tied too closely to prescribed methods or definitions, or can we hope that every immigrant will be a success any more than every native-born Canadian is a success. Three thousand years ago a wise man wrote with penetrating insight and a sense of proportion: "He that observeth the wind shall not sow; and he that regardeth the clouds shall not reap. As thou knowest not what is the way of the spirit, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child, even so thou knowest not

[Sir Joseph Flavelle.]

the works of God who maketh all. In the morning sow thy seed and in the evening withhold not thine hand, though thou knowest not whether shall prosper either this or that, or whether they both alike shall be good."

That is my philosophy in relation to all affairs, whether in the Church, or in finance, or in public matters.

We have a very much freer hand in private affairs. If we make mistakes, as we all do; if we fall into some innocent error, as we all may, there is no angry question about it. I fully recognize that public men, whose acts are reviewed in Parliament from the standpoint of endeavouring to catch them in some indiscretion that will tell against them—it is part of the game in public life—are in an infinitely more difficult position than we men in private affairs. But I venture to say that there is not one law for the wise administration of private affairs, and another law for the wise administration of public affairs. While the application of it may be different, and what men will do in one field is much easier than in the other field, we do need—and this is said with no reflection upon the Government or the Honourable Ministers—in all affairs that are of first-class importance—we need it in all affairs, but particularly in matters of first-class importance—to be careful that the letter does not kill the spirit. Whether it is farming on the prairies, whether it is carrying on in the cities or towns, the strength, and size, and measure, and quality will be primarily determined by the spirit, and I use that in its broadest sense.

In the application of it I hold with great earnestness that we should exercise all the safeguards, all the wise safeguards, all the prudent safeguards, as to the character of people who come to our shores.

You may ask me any questions you like, without any embarrassment of any answer that I would make. I only venture to bring to the Committee my sincere conviction that if you choose the best plan that the united wisdom of the Committee can develop, it will ultimately only be the size of the spirit which lies back of it. I presume that there are sincere differences of opinion in the country, and I would suppose in the Committee as in the country, as to how far you will give rein, as I would, in the consideration of a big subject. I would let go. There is never any trouble about introducing the necessary safeguards, and the minutiae of plans, and I am frank in saying that, irrespective of party, I believe that we have singularly lacked vision, not only in relation to our own economic betterment, but to the responsibility which we have in being the custodians of this great trust, this amazing land from the Atlantic to the Pacific in which our fathers, in the days of their feebleness, in the days of their separation by great physical barriers, had the size and the imagination and constructive courage that are ever proof, to me personally, when I commence to falter on a job that ought to be well done.

I am quite aware that I am only dealing in generalities. It would be foolish for me to attempt to deal with particulars, as I have never had the job. I do not know anything about the details. I do not know how one man would work out his details as against the other. No two men of great strength plan in the same fashion. I do believe that we have not succeeded in interpreting as the sense of British people, as the sense of the original conception of the Fathers of Confederation interpreted; I do think that we have succeeded well in our interpretation of the movement of people from the British Isles. I am not particular to inquire why; I think the facts tell the story. I am not thinking that we should be British instead of Canadians; I am not thinking that we should carry a secondary view of the responsibility which we owe, as Canadians, to our own land. I had the opportunity of observing conditions closely during the war, and I think somehow, I do not know through what cause, that we have slipped a cog. There has been the danger on both sides, theirs as well as ours, of finding

[Sir Joseph Flavelle.]

fault with one another, rather than working together, and I think it is a job which is capable of correction, not through recrimination, for we never correct jobs that way, not by fault-finding and not by imputing ungenerous actions to anyone, but in the application of business sense and good judgment and co-operative effort. And may I say this in that respect? I do not think any single thing has commended my respect in the latter years of my life so much as the enormous gain shown in co-operative effort. I have had an opportunity for many years to examine balance sheets, profit and loss statements and a great body of business of every description in every province of Canada. I had an opportunity during the war to live very close to a large body of manufacturers who found difficulty in establishing a basis for dependable deliveries in munitions of war. I have had the privilege of counseling with friends who came to me with their business problems, both when successful and when they went wrong, and all the remedy—I am almost impertinent enough to carry it to the point of “all”—but the overwhelming remedy lies in their own hands, not through outside agencies, not through governments, not through regulations, but by the ability to understand their problems and to work them out co-operatively within their own establishments. I venture to bring to the Committee the expression of the hope that in the difficult task you will have in dealing—and I am not playing the preacher—with all of the various suggestions which come before you, whatever else you do, keep your consideration big; neither Catholic nor Protestant, neither churchmen nor non-conformists, neither racial—except in so far as you find the stern limits which you feel you ought to set to the preservation of the essential spirit of the British people in this Dominion. Let your consideration be on the big side. All of the little things will come in anyhow; you cannot keep them out, and if in the big question of immigration, if it be by commission—which I would regret personally, as I think the genius of our operations is by responsible ministers—but by whatever means you chose, let it be big and fair and sincere. If there is a good reason why we should exclude some people and admit others, in so far as political exigencies will permit, be frank about it. We should not fool ourselves by conveying the impression that we are doing one thing, while behind it there are influences and concerns and anxieties which make it impossible to put your hearts into doing it that way. Gentlemen, I have no more to say, except to answer any questions you may care to ask.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are a number of questions, I would suggest that we adjourn until this afternoon. Is it the wish of the Committee that Sir Joseph be asked to come back this afternoon? We can also then hear Miss Childs.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: I notice the agenda is growing and fresh witnesses are being called. Our duty will be to report to the House before the conclusion of parliament, and if we continue hearing witnesses for another week or two we will never get to our report. I would suggest we try to have a quorum here this afternoon to hear the witnesses who have been summoned.

The CHAIRMAN: Miss Childs has been asked to be here to-day and I think we should endeavour to get a quorum to hear her. The Committee will stand adjourned until four o'clock.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until 4 p.m.

The Committee resumed at 4 o'clock p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

The CHAIRMAN: Sir Joseph Flavelle is in the room. Are there any questions which any member of the Committee would like to ask him. If not, I will ask Miss Childs, Secretary of the Social Welfare Commission of Winnipeg, to give us her views on immigration.

Miss GERTRUDE CHILDS called and sworn.

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I am General Secretary of the Social Welfare Commission of the City of Winnipeg, and during the winter months I am also Secretary of the Unemployment Committee, which is also a Committee appointed by the Council to deal with that question during the winter. The funds we expend are public funds secured through taxation. We have in Winnipeg no private organization doing social work or welfare work. Certain organizations do extend small amounts for individuals who come to their attention, but almost the entire work of caring for families comes under our jurisdiction.

Because we are spending public funds, we are in a little different position from the people who as private organizations have money coming to them to expend as they like. Our problem seems to be that a number of people who come to Canada are not established or assimilated. As I understand it, there are going through the country men who ask for application forms to be signed for the bringing to Canada of farm labour. In some instances a good many are secured in that way. I know of an instance where one of the representatives of a company went out, attended a large meeting in a community, and at that meeting got twenty signatures. His chief reason for going to that meeting was that he got a commission for every signature he obtained. The viewpoint of getting just what they needed, or just what was coming to the family, how they could get along, was not taken into consideration.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Was he a representative of a steamship company?—A. Of a steamship company?

By Mr. Coote:

Q. You said that he would get a commission from the steamship company?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Did you say he was a representative of a steamship company, or of a railway company?—A. He was a representative of a steamship company, he made a statement to one of my staff who is Polish, whom he asked with reference to the signing of applications for admission to Canada of a person that it was absolutely essential that the person be employed by the one who signed the application. Amongst the group we come in contact with are some who are physically unfit for our country.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Do you know of any other instances, of your own knowledge, where that statement was made?—A. No. That is the only one that has come direct to my attention.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Was it last winter?—A. It was about a year ago. We find a great many in the group who are brought out are used to conveniences, used to running water, and light, and they are not used to living in territories where they have

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

no conveniences and where they are very far away from other people. The result is a gradual drifting back into the city of families who get into difficulties in the winter time.

Q. When you speak of people who are used to conveniences, to running water, and light, are you referring to people from Great Britain, or from the continent as well?—A. Both. I have concrete cases here which have been brought to the attention of the Commissioner of Immigration in Winnipeg, and which I thought I might give you an outline of.

Q. I mean that what you say applies to people both from Great Britain and the Continent?—A. A great many of the British born are accustomed to conveniences. We also find that families are placed on the land, with farmers, who will only employ them for a portion of the year. We find a complication where a man and wife are placed on the land, when the children come. Sometimes when the first child arrives they put up with him, until there is a second one, but very few farmers want a man with a wife and family. A week before I came away I had a letter from a woman in the country asking me if I could place a child which was not born. She was on a farm owned by a bachelor farmer, where there were no children around. They could not take care of any more children, and she suggested that the baby be adopted out. That certainly is not a good situation.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. In that case they lived in the home with the farmer?—A. They lived in the home along with the farmer. That is one of the chief difficulties—there is no separate accommodation, in a great many instances.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. How would it come to your attention? Did they come into the city to see you?—A. No, she wrote. We are pretty well known throughout the province, and she wrote to us and asked if we were not the proper ones, to refer her letter to the proper party. When these people come drifting in, as they generally do, without furniture or house furnishings of any kind, as a general rule they establish themselves in a furnished room. They are lucky if they have the first month's rent. They have no prospect of employment, and little prospect of establishing themselves as we think people in Canada should live.

As we see it, it is the country that needs population, not the city. Winnipeg is pretty well crowded with people who cannot be assimilated, for two reasons; the first is that work is not available all the year around, and every year we have the complication of the people drifting back into the city, people who have to be kept from that year to the following year, and people who keep coming in. There is no employment for them during the winter months. We have to face that. In some way or other we need some readjustment. I would like to run through a few of the letters I have taken from this file, which contains copies of letters sent to the Department of Immigration during 1927 and during 1928 up until a week ago.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Before reading them, Miss Childs, in your opinion is there sufficient employment during the winter months in the city of Winnipeg for the labouring people located there?—A. No.

Q. There is always unemployment amongst your own residents?—A. Since we opened a special department for the unemployed, during the winter of 1920-1921, the first winter we had it. Previous to that time we considered 100 unemployed men a normal situation, and anything over and above 100 was abnormal.

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

I am speaking only of families who require assistance. We deal only with families who require assistance, who have not been able to provide for the winter from their summer earnings.

Q. People who apply?—A. Yes. That is true of the labouring man. The labouring man does not save sufficient for his winter requirements out of his summer earnings. Each winter we have had a special department for unemployment. For the past three winters I have been Secretary of the Commission appointed by Council to deal with that question, and while the numbers have gone down, for last year we had a total registration of 578 families.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I have not the figures here, but I have them upstairs. They have been reducing the number every year for the last three years, the number of unemployed?—A. We have been reducing the number, for the reason that we have not dealt with single unemployed men for the last three winters.

Q. There has been a tremendous drop. I will get the figures?—A. There has been a tremendous drop, for the reason that for three years we have not dealt also with married men with less than three dependants.

By the Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. You mean you refuse applications for relief from single men and married men with two children?—A. We do not even register them. Previous to that we registered all that came along.

Q. Are these your own citizens you are speaking of?—A. Yes. There is another change in policy; during the last two years we have dealt only with families which have registered in Winnipeg and who have lived there for at least one year. Previous to that time they came in from other parts of the province and from other provinces, the idea being that relief was available and therefore they would come into Winnipeg and be ready for it.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I thought the statistics given for relief to the citizens of Winnipeg showed that the majority of them had been over five years in Winnipeg?—A. The figures for the last two years show more than that; they show that the majority have been more than ten years. I claim that these families who have been there over ten years, the number being 822 in 1925-1926 and 533 in 1926-1927, are still families who came here to go on the land but never got there; they remained in the city. A large majority of them have a knowledge of farm work, and a recommendation has been made by this Committee for the past three years that some plan be adopted whereby we would have the opportunity of placing on the land groups of these people who wanted to be put on the land, but who have had no opportunity to go there: It is not feasible to put families on the land, without any capital.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Do you say these families you speak of now came to Canada originally for the purpose of obtaining farm employment?—A. Not all of them. That is the total figure of those who had relief. Some of those had no intention of going on the land, and some of them came with the intention of going on the land but did not get there.

Q. What proportion would there be who you say have been three years in Winnipeg and intended to go on the land?—A. Only 6.22 who had been between two and three years previous to 1925 and 1926, and 7.43 in 1926-1927.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. The rest had been longer than that?—A. The large majority has been longer than that.

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

Q. Have you the registration figures for the last two years, of those who were eligible under the regulations?—A. Not the last two years, we have not. I have only registered and kept track of those who were eligible under the regulations laid down. That is responsible for the drop in the number as well, because the majority were registered.

Q. Of the people we want to know about you have no record?—A. Not the people who have been here only a short time, not in the unemployment situation. In Winnipeg the only thing we can give you is the odd families which have come to us in this particular way.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Are those people who had been on the land but came back to Winnipeg?
A. A good many of them.

Q. How long had they been on the land?—A. Many had been on the land two or three years; some of them for a longer period of time. I had one family come to me a month ago who had been seven years on a farm. The man had worked on the railroad, and had only ten acres broken, but his health gave and when he saw no chance of supporting his family on the railway he brought them to the city.

Q. But I take it that these people you speak about came there originally to go on the land, went on the land, stayed there two or three years, then went back to Winnipeg?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. This man you referred to right now was a section foreman?—A. A labouring man on the railway; he was on the land and hoped to become a farmer.

Q. But his principal occupation was that of a railway labourer?—A. Yes.

Q. He was never established on the farm at all?—A. He was never established there. That is the weak point—they do not get established.

Q. We had a case this afternoon along the same lines?—A. I have this letter, dated March 29th, 1928. These are all letters written to Mr. Gelley, the Commissioner of Immigration at Winnipeg (reading):—

“April 2, 1928.

“ Mr. THOS. GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
Winnipeg, Man.

“ DEAR SIR,—

“ Re *Mr. Istman Elles, 429 Henry Ave.*

“ The above-named man applied for assistance owing to the fact that he is non-resident and an immigrant, having been less than one year in Canada. He is not eligible for help from this office.

“ Mr. Elles told our worker that he came to Canada on the 26th of April, 1927, on the *Montreal*, having landed at Quebec with his wife and four children.

“ The family appears on the ship's manifest sheet 24, lines 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15. They travelled inland on the C.P.R.

“ Mr. Elles stated that he had about \$700 cash upon arrival and was advised on disembarkation by some Hungarian agent at Quebec that there is good, cheap land at Kipling, Sask.

“ He came to Winnipeg some time in May, 1927, and after a stay of one month the family left for Kipling, where Mr. Elles purchased a farm on which he made an initial payment and later found he had made a bad deal.

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

"He abandoned the farm at the end of July or beginning of August, 1927, and went to Welland, Ont., where he stayed during August, September and October. From November to the end of January the family lived in Fort William, Ont. They came to Winnipeg on the 1st of February last and since then have spent the balance of Mr. Elles' money. At the present time the eldest son, aged 17, is a patient in the General Hospital suffering from a fractured leg. Another child, aged 7, is in King George Hospital suffering from diphtheria.

"Mr. Elles is unable to get any employment and his family, now consisting of his wife and two children, aged 2 and 4 respectively, are in need. They are being supplied with provisions by a kindly neighbour, Mrs. F. Nichols, 435 Henry avenue, at the present time.

"We are referring this case to your department for consideration.

"Yours truly,

"SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION."

"March 29, 1928.

"MR. THOMAS GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
C.P.R. Building, City.

Re Mrs. Elsie Quinnell, 484 Newman St.

"DEAR SIR,—In reference to the above-named Mrs. Quinnell whom you referred to this Commission for assistance, we find that her husband, Mr. Charles Quinnell, was born in England in 1894, and after leaving school worked as a machinist in the Great Western Railways, until he came to Canada in 1927, landing about July 20, by the ss. *Doric* at Quebec, coming direct to Winnipeg via C.N.R. He was accompanied by his wife who was born in London, England, in 1891, and their two children, Elsie, born in 1914, and Edward, born in 1918.

"As Mrs. Quinnell's only sister, Mrs. Price, lived in Winnipeg, the family thought they would like to come hoping to better their circumstances in Canada. Mrs. Price sent eleven pounds towards passage money, and we understand from Mrs. Quinnell that the balance was secured from a real estate agent in London, and another gentleman who went security. As Mrs. Quinnell is very vague about this transaction, we have no definite information on it, as she said her husband attended to the business. She claims they are now owing forty pounds on passage money.

"After coming to Winnipeg, the only work that Mr. Quinnell had was about two months with the Dominion Bridge Company as a labourer, and as Mrs. Price's husband, who is a traveller, has been out of work more or less, Mr. Quinnell got in touch with the British Dominion Immigration Society in London, and passage was provided for his return to England, and he was advised to take the first boat. Mr. Quinnell left Winnipeg on February 3, 1928, and is at present living with his mother, Mrs. Emily Quinnell, 17 Pember Road, Kensal Rise, London, England, and expects to be reinstated with the Great Western Railways.

"Mrs. Quinnell is entirely without means, having been, with her two children, supported by her sister, Mrs. Price, since coming to Canada,

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

and she has been obliged to call in a doctor who says that she is mentally ill due to worry over her circumstances. Social Welfare Commission is sending in food pending an adjustment.

"This is for your information.

Yours truly,

SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION."

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Would you state whether this man had any assistance in coming to Canada, or whether he came on his own?—A. He came on his own, I presume, as he had \$700 cash on his arrival.

Q. Do you think anybody who had \$700 cash on arrival would therefore not be assisted?—A. I do not know. That is something I could not tell you.

Q. At any rate, he came on his own?—A. Yes.

Q. And he was not assisted in the ordinary way, or given the assistance that in the ordinary way would be given to a man who came out on an assisted passage?—A. I presume not. We have a file on each one of these cases. I simply have the copies of the letters which were sent to the Department, and I had to wire for those because I did not come down expecting to give any information.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You said he came from Montreal. Did you say that he was English?—A. I presume he is not English, because his first name is "Istman." I presume he is not, from that, although the letter does not give his nationality. His second name is "Elles".

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I would draw this point to Miss Childs' attention. These families came out of their own volition, and there were no false promises of any kind. They came out, and had bad luck, and things went wrong with them. I would ask Miss Childs what she is attempting to prove now?—A. I am not attempting to prove anything; I am simply placing before you the cases that come before us, and the problems they present.

Q. What remedy would there be. Things have gone wrong with these families, and that might happen to any family, whether immigrant, or whatever they are. Speaking for myself, unless you can show us that they came out under some false promise, or that something was held out to them to induce them to come to Canada that did not turn out to be true, and some one was guilty of that, I do not see what we can do about it. Those people came out of their own volition, and things went wrong.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. I think the witness is absolutely right in giving these particulars. Here is a case of a family coming out of their own volition, and they have not asked anything from the Government. Something has happened, a broken leg it may be, and they desire the same treatment that parties who have come over under the Assisted Passage Service receive.—A. Surely.

MR. ARTHURS: I think the Committee is desirous of hearing that, and I think we should give exactly the same or better treatment to these cases where a family comes out of its own volition as to those who have come on assisted passage.

HON. MR. FORKE: I may say, Mr. Chairman, that tomorrow, or at the next meeting, we will be able to give you the history of these families.

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

Mr. ARTHURS: This lady is giving us the real history.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I am not questioning what the witness says, but I am trying to find out who is responsible for this sort of thing.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps if we allow Miss Childs to proceed, it will save time. We have the file number of the letters.

Mr. ARTHURS: The trouble is that many of these letters do not appear on the records of this Committee until seven or eight days after the witness has given his or her testimony.

Discussion followed.

The CHAIRMAN: Proceed, Miss Childs.

The next letter I have is as follows:—(Reading).

April 13th, 1928.

Mr. Thomas GELLEY,
Commission of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
C.P.R. Building,
City.

Re: *William (Deceased) & Barbara Brown, 712 Corydon Ave.*

“DEAR SIR:

“Alice, aged 29 years; Hector, aged 27 years; William, aged 26 years; Barbara, aged 24 years; Mary, aged 22 years; Robert, aged 18 years; John, aged 15 years; James, aged 13 years; George Andrew, aged 12 years.

“The above-named family was first brought to our attention in 1924 due to suffering the loss of their furniture by fire.

“Mr. Brown was born in Scotland in 1864, and had a good education. At 17 years of age he joined the Imperial Army, and served 21 years with the Royal Field Artillery, serving in India for 10 years. Later he was on the reserve forces until the South African War, when he served, and was discharged in 1903 due to illness. He was receiving a pension of ten shillings and sixpence per week.

“In 1898 Mr. Brown was married to Barbara Henderson who was born in Scotland in 1875.

“After the South African War Mr. Brown returned to Edinburgh, Scotland, and worked as a carpenter until 1916 when he enlisted with the Royal Defence Corps in Edinburgh, and as he was too old to go to the war he was employed guarding prisoners. Shortly after he was invalided home to Edinburgh and discharged in 1916. After his discharge was receiving 60 per cent allowance as he was unable to work.

“In 1924 Mr. Brown decided to come to Canada, as the three older children were in Winnipeg, and the family left Glasgow on May 23, 1924, travelling by the ss. *Marloch*, landing at Quebec on June 1st, coming direct via C.P.R. to Winnipeg. They had an advance of six months pension to pay fares. We understand there were bonds signed for Mr. Brown's entry into Canada. After reaching Canada, Mr. Brown was never able to do any work, and was supported by his family. He died on September 5, 1927, of gastric ulcers.

“At the present time the only income into the home is as follows:
“\$20 per month from the daughter Barbara, who is employed by the Indian Bay School. \$20 per month from the daughter Mary, who works as a maid. \$25 per month from the daughter Alice who works as a cook.

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

"This makes a total income of \$65 per month and is not sufficient for the family, and the Social Welfare Commission has been supplying relief since February 8, 1928.

"Mr. Brown's pension which amounted to \$65 per month at time of his death, was discontinued due to his death not being caused by war disabilities.

"The sons Hector and William are unemployed.

"We are forwarding this for your information.

"Yours truly,

"SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION."

The older boys of the family were not willing to take work outside of Winnipeg, and that was the complication in that situation.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. How old were the oldest boys?—A. Twenty-six and twenty-seven; all a grown-up family.

Q. And why were they not willing to take work outside of Winnipeg?—A. They were not willing to accept work out of Winnipeg. The woman applied for an allowance under the Mothers' Allowance for the younger children.

Q. Did any of this family come over on the assisted passage?—A. They got an advance of his pension to come over with; several months advance of his pension.

Q. But they did not come out under the assisted passage.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. Did you speak of a son in that family 26 years of age?—A. Hector, 27 years; William, 26; Robert, 18, and John 15.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. When did they come here?—A. That was in April, when they applied for assistance.

Q. I do not see anything important in that at all, and I think you had better drop any cases of that kind.—A. (Reads)

"15913

Mr. THOS. GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
C.P.R. Building, City.

Nov. 29, 1927.

Re: May Bissett, 913 William avenue

Dear Sir:

The above-named girl was referred to this Department for institutional care. When an investigation was made we found that May was born in Scotland on June 24, 1914. Her father was Thomas Bissett, who was employed as a steel worker. Shortly after her birth her father signed up with the Queen's Own Scottish Regiment and went to France. He was later transferred to the Dardennells, where he was wounded. At this time May's mother, who is now Mrs. Jos. Brown of the above address, received a letter from the Commanding Officer of her husband's regiment, stating that he had been badly wounded. Nothing further was heard except in an indirect way, that May's father died in March 1916 in the Dardennells.

In October 1920, May's mother decided to come to Canada as she had a sister, Mrs. Fred Steele, now deceased, who was then living at 462 Furby street. Mrs. Steele paid half of passage for May and her mother, and they arrived at Quebec on the ss. *Sicilian*, on October 13, 1920, coming direct to Winnipeg via C.P.R. May's mother supported herself and May by making lamp shades and doing day work.

On November 21, 1922, Mrs. Bissett married a Mr. Joseph Brown, who was a labourer at the C.N.R. shops. By this marriage there are two children, William, four years of age, and Hazel, two and a half years of age. Due to domestic difficulties between Mr. and Mrs. Brown, a separation was secured in October, 1926, and an allowance of \$35 per month was assigned to Mrs. Brown.

Mrs. Brown applied to this Commission on October 6, 1927, for institutional care for May. May has been examined by Dr. Mathers of the Psychopathic Hospital, whose report states that she is epileptic and has a mental age of nine years. The epileptic condition began at the age of two years.

We are forwarding this for your information.

Yours truly,

SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION."

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Do any of those letters that you are reading to the Committee deal with people who came out assisted by the British Government, or the Canadian Government, or who received any governmental help? So far the letters have just dealt with people who came to Canada on their own account.—A. You are more interested in the assisted passage? Here is one that deals with the question of coming to employment that was not here. (Reads)

"February 28, 1927.

Mr. T. GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
Winnipeg, Man.

Dear Sir:

Attention has been drawn to Mr. John Ken, 790 Stella Ave., and his family consisting of his wife and three children, who are residing at 790 Stella avenue.

Mr. Ken claims that he came to Canada, arriving in Winnipeg on January 23, 1927, when he proceeded to work at Kamsack only to find that the farmer who had made application for his admission had retired, and there was no work for him.

I understand that the family are in need, and have asked Mr. Ken to take this letter to you.

Yours truly,

Secretary."

Q. Did he get assisted passage?—A. I do not know how he came.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. What happened to him afterwards?—A. He was referred to the Immigration Department for adjustment in another position. In the meantime assistance was given. (Reads)

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

"15489

"MR. THOS. GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
Winnipeg, Man.

Feb. 9, 1927.

Re: William and Agnes McClure, 1240 Pritchard avenue. Children:
Mary 15, Dan 14, John 8, Agnes 6 and Doreen 1 month.

Dear Sir:

We would like to bring to your attention the condition of the above-named family, particulars being as follows:

Mr. and Mrs. McClure were both born in Scotland where Mr. McClure was a machine man, and was employed for eight years in the chemical works at Dumbarton, Scotland.

They decided to go to Australia in 1910, and settled in Brisbane, where they lived for ten years, Mr. McClure being employed most of this time as a conductor on the Street Railway there, and in 1920 was earning as much at £8 per week. Owing to his wife's health they decided to sell up their home, etc., and returned to Scotland.

For three years in Scotland Mr. McClure did very little work and seeing the advertisements on the rosey prospects of Canada he decided to come over here and came with the harvesters in August, 1924, landing at Quebec and travelling on the C.P.R. as far as Winnipeg, from where he went direct to the employment of Jas. McAllister, Tuxedo. He paid his harvester's fare of £12 himself.

His wife and four children followed him in May, 1925, their transportation being paid by the Government. They also arrived at Quebec and travelled on the C.P.R. to Winnipeg, from where they went to Tuxedo, Mr. McClure having a home ready for them there.

On leaving the employment of Mr. McAllister in January, 1926, they moved to St. Vital, where Mr. McClure found temporary employment in a box factory. In May, 1926, they came into Winnipeg, Mr. McClure getting employment with Claydon Brothers, and from August to December, 1926, he had employment with McDermot & Co., since when he has failed to get employment.

Mr. McClure, on January 27, 1927, applied at the Emergency Unemployment Relief Dept., but being found to be a non-resident and owing to his short time in Canada he was referred to this office and has been supplied with groceries, bread and milk and one cord of wood, as investigation showed that there was an infant in the house, and there was no fuel or food.

We would be glad if you would do your utmost to re-establish this family in the city or in the country somewhere. Mr. McClure has good recommendations both in Scotland and in Australia and he feels he would do well in Winnipeg as a street-car conductor if such a position could be found for him.

The family are Catholics and attend the Immaculate Conception Church and Rev. Father McAuley of that church has kindly consented to have them visited and do what he can to procure employment for Mr. McClure.

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

We are unable at present to give the names of the steamships in which Mr. McClure came in 1924 and his family in 1925, as he has quite forgotten the names at present and is unable to locate his Landing Card but perhaps the dates of August, 1924, for Mr. McClure and May, 1925, for Mrs. McClure and the four children may be of assistance to you.

Trusting you may be able to re-establish them or assist them in some way, we are,

Yours truly,

SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,

Per

Secretary."

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I think it is incorrect to say that the passage was given by the Government.—A. That is a very general statement.

Q. It would be probably a loan by that association or it might be a loan by the Government?—A. This is only her statement; it was not a verified statement.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. What salary was he getting in Australia?—A. He was getting £8 per week.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. How long did he have employment in Saskatchewan?—A. He was employed there from August, 1924, to January, 1926.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. At what rate?—A. I have not the amount he was earning.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Did he then come to Winnipeg?—A. He then moved into Winnipeg and found temporary employment in a box factory.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. He did not get £8 per week on the farm?—A. No. Do you wish me to pick out the ones where this is assisted passage?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I would think so, because, so far, I do not see what the connection is with the Department.

Mr. COOTE: I would like to express a very different view from that. I think these matters are of very great interest to the Committee. Here are families that are stranded in Winnipeg, and are dependent on charity. They have come here because of our immigration policy, and we ought to know just the people that are coming, and just what problems we have because they come.

Mr. ARTHURS: I would suggest that the Department of Immigration be absolved of all responsibility, as far as these are concerned, and that the witness should put on file the letters which she is not now reading, and that we should proceed with those which are directly attributable to the Department of Immigration, those who came under the assisted passage.

The WITNESS: To sort out those which come definitely under that group would take time, and, as I understand it, the problem is a present day problem as it comes to us. If they are not of interest, that is different.

Mr. ARTHURS: They certainly are of interest, and I would suggest that you read those which are directly or indirectly connected with the Department. The others can be put in and we will read them all.

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

By Mr. Coote:

Q. I have been out trying to get a few more members to help make a quorum for this Committee, and I did not hear you say just what position you held. It would be of interest to myself, and to other members, if you would just tell us what position you hold?—A. I am secretary of the Social Welfare Commission, and of the Unemployment Committee of the city of Winnipeg, through which assistance is given to indigent families in that city.

Q. And, as a result of the position which you hold, you have come in close contact with some people who came here as immigrants within the last few years, and you are able to give the Committee an idea of the problem which they bring to the people of Winnipeg?—A. There are different reasons why they have found it necessary to have assistance. Some of them are likely to be permanent public charges.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Why should they become permanent public charges?—A. The child I just mentioned, May Bissett. The application came to us for institutional care for an epileptic child of thirteen.

Q. How did that child arrive in Canada; by the direction of the Department of Immigration or through the family's own violation?—A. My point on that is, regardless of how she came to Canada, that she was, as I understand it, a prohibited immigrant. Another thing, even if she were not a prohibited immigrant, if these kind of people are to be located in Canada, ought we not to face the situation and realize that somebody is going to have to maintain them. They are going to have to be maintained by public funds, and the citizens, as a whole, are going to have to provide money to care for the problems of people from other countries. It is neither in the interests of the families to come here, or in the interests of the country to have them here, and they go on indefinitely bringing their own kind into the world.

Mr. COOTE: I do not think the statement can be disputed that the majority of people in our public institutions in the western provinces are people that were not born in Canada. Certainly, if we do not exercise great care in connection with immigration, we are going to have a great problem on our hands. In the western provinces we have a financial burden right now, coming directly as a result of immigration. I think that the statements which Miss Childs has been giving to the Committee are certainly very worth while, and they impress upon the Committee the problem that is being placed upon the provinces through immigration. I think the evidence, as it comes from Miss Childs, should receive the very careful consideration of the Committee, so that, if there is anything lax in the administration of the immigration law, we should correct it.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. The proposition put forward by you, Miss Childs, covers, largely, individual cases. You have not mentioned more than one case where a child, migrating to Canada, either under the direction of the Immigration Department or otherwise, is liable to become a public charge. These cases are of course important.—A. Every letter I have here is definitely dealing with a family which has become a public charge.

Q. A charitable charge?—A. Public charges with us, because the funds come from public taxation.

Q. In the province of Manitoba?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Do you have any opportunity of following these cases during the ensuing year? If these people are out of work and have to be taken care of—does that continue year after year?—A. With some of them, year after year. We do not

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

refer to the Immigration Department every family who comes to our attention, by any means. We refer to them families who, we consider, require adjustment or require to be returned to their own country, due to the likelihood of their becoming permanent public charges. We do not recommend deportation.

Q. I take it the record is merely a record of some particular season. Those people may have been employed the following year at some useful labour. Have you any record to show whether or not that is true?—A. I have one family which has come to us year after year since 1922, and which has not yet established itself, nor is it likely to.

Q. Are you suggesting that this large file which you say you have represents those who are permanently being taken care of by the city of Winnipeg, or is it just for one season?—A. Each year we have large groups coming to us who require adjustment, who cannot maintain themselves and are not likely to maintain themselves the year round in the city of Winnipeg.

Q. Are you referring to the same individuals?—A. No, each year we have recurring groups. Some come back to us year after year, and some come to us and through the Immigration Department are adjusted. I am not saying any of this in a spirit of criticism of the Department at all, because we have perfectly wonderful co-operation in those cases.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. The welfare work is not confined to those families who are immigrants?—A. No.

Q. You take in all those who were born in Canada and are in unfortunate circumstances?—A. In our city.

Q. Could you give the Committee any estimate as to the percentage of those coming under your welfare work who are Canadian born and are immigrants?—A. Our statistics would show. I have not a copy of our annual report with me, but it would show the number of families dealt with, and the length of time they have been in Canada. Last year we had in the neighbourhood of 1,200 families who had assistance from the Welfare Commission in addition to the unemployment group which amount to approximately 600. The fact is that we have between 200 and 300 families who have been dealt with through the Immigration Department in letter form, and that shows that quite a large percentage of them are people who have not acquired domicile under the five-year policy.

Q. Could you go back over your books and statistics and give the percentage of those you have dealt with who were immigrants?—A. Yes. Our statistics are based on under five years in Canada.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. As I understand it you have no figures regarding anybody who has not been here twelve months—or longer than that?—A. No, not in this group. In the Social Welfare Commission we do not assist the family who has been less than one year in Canada; we give them a letter to the Department asking them to adjust them.

Q. Nor do you register them?—A. Nor do we register them as unemployed.

Q. So you would have no figures about them at all?—A. No.

Q. And you did not register any family in the last two years, even though they have been here longer than twelve months, who did not have two children?—A. One child; two dependents, which means a wife and one child. The Social Welfare Commission deals with those who have been in Canada less than a year on a service basis, but not on the basis of giving assistance. If there is anything we can do in helping them adjust themselves—

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

Q. But is it not, however, these people who, to use Mr. Edwards' expression, are in unfortunate circumstances—because that is the problem you have to deal with?—A. That is our problem.

Q. You cannot tell us from your books the number of recent immigrants who have applied for assistance?—A. No, not those who have not been a year in Canada, with the exception of the very odd one.

Q. And "the very odd one" is represented by these letters?—A. No, under one year if a man comes to us and makes an application he gets a letter of reference to the Immigration Department.

Q. Are some of them people who have been here less than one year?—A. Who have practically been here more than a year, some of them three or four or five years.

Q. Can you go back to your books and give us the number of families whom you assisted last year, and give the number of those families who came into this country within the last five years under assisted passage?—A. Those figures could be secured.

Q. I would like to see those who have not come in under assisted passage, because they are immigrants as well. You are not in a position to-day to give us an estimate of the percentage?—A. No.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Can you differentiate between British and foreign?—A. If the figures are to be secured, it will mean going through the file, and I could then get any information you desire.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. We want those who have come in within the last five years, separating the British from the foreign, and in the case of British, separating the assisted passages from those who have received no assistance.—A. Yes.

By Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. May I ask one other question? I have in mind the case you were reading when I came in where there were a number of children in the family, a couple of them 25 or 26 years old. I presume since you have those on your file, that family was given assistance?—A. Yes.

Q. Notwithstanding the fact that two of the boys refused to work?—A. They refused to accept work in the country. The fact remains that the younger children would have suffered.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. How does the number of those distressed families of which you spoke compare as between the winter and summer?—A. In the winter season we have a group of labourers who only work during the summer months. They cannot provide for the winter months; their earnings are not sufficient. If a man is earning between 30 and 40 cents an hour, which is the recognized labour wage with us, and works seven months out of the twelve at an average of \$70 or \$80, he cannot make \$560 spread over 12 months for himself, his wife and three children, and we consider five an average family.

Q. Would a large number of those families be those who have secured work in the spring and were turned out in the fall?—A. The reason for the change of policy of the unemployment department to deal only with families who have been a year in the city was that a large number which had unemployment relief, of which Mr. Forke spoke, was greatly increased by the people who worked in the summer and came into Winnipeg in the winter. They could make no provision for themselves.

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

Q. Then the root of the trouble lies really in the fact that we have work for a great number of people in the summer, and very little in the winter.—A. That is the difficulty with us.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Why not establish some industry?—A. I do not see how you will have your labouring man, who is foreign born, adjust himself to any other condition.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I went into the employment office about two weeks ago in Winnipeg and in a room I saw 30 or 40 girls, and I asked the lady in charge if she was holding a meeting. She said no, that the girls were waiting for day work. I wanted a girl to go on the farm and said I would pay \$30 or \$40 a month, for the right kind of girl, and she told me that none of those girls would go on a farm, that all they wanted was day work.—A. Mr. Forke, you have to take into consideration that a large number of those people whom you saw in the employment office were married women. Our winter complication is that where the men are out of work the women will work. I quite recognize the difficulty of getting them to accept country work. We come up against it all of the time, of a group who are not looking for work in the country, and who do not want to take it, and they do not want to put up with the inconvenience of country life. We are rapidly losing our spirit of competing with difficulties.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Have you any suggestions to make as to how you can overcome that difficulty?—A. There are two or three things. First of all there is not much use in bringing a family into the West and dumping them on to a farm without any provision being made for their maintaining themselves there. They will not stay there. Just as soon as Fall comes they will come to Winnipeg, and you cannot blame them.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Why not Calgary?—A. Winnipeg is pretty well known as having a very well organized relief commission. The fact remains that there is not in any other part of Canada a place that is so well organized, and the logical thing is for a man with a family, if he can see no way of providing for that family, to go where the provision is. We want them to stay where they are, and a good many of them would stay if they had some assistance, but the big thing is not to bring them in and dump them down on a farm in the spring. They do not get any supervision, they do not get any advice, and when the fall comes and they cannot see their way clear they leave. It is much more difficult to get them back the second time than if they stayed there. Each family that comes into the city and gets used to the conveniences of city life hesitates to part with them.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. You think the government should make some provision for getting these people over a certain term of years?—A. Yes. A certain period, to give them a chance.

Q. You are sitting directly in front of a map of the Dominion with the Province of Ontario behind you. Would you apply that to Ontario?—A. Well, the situation in Ontario is a little different from the situation in Manitoba.

Q. Why?—A. The suffering is a great deal more severe in our climate, and we have a shorter period of work.

Q. Would you say that about Cochrane, that railway junction up there?—A. There are portions of Ontario which are pretty difficult, I will admit.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. The employment situation in Cochrane is not so seasonable as it is in the West?—A. No, that stands to reason. Our season is very short, both in the city and in the country, and you have to take that into consideration. You cannot sidetrack it, and you are never going to get anywhere as long as you are just going to bring in your immigrants and not see that they are provided for. Assistance on the farm is far more valuable than assistance off the farm.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Do you think it would be better to take care of immigrants who come from any country in Europe than to provide for men on the farms in Ontario? Take the case of one man with five sons on the farm, and four of them have to leave. Do you think that the same provision should be made for such a man in the West as is made for the new immigrant?—A. Is it not logical that the people who have lived here and who know our conditions should have the first opportunity? They are going to make better citizens than the others.

Q. They are going to make better citizens and would not require the assistance furnished in Winnipeg, as a rule?—A. Not as a rule.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I would like to get this straightened out. The Immigration Department is not placing people on farms in western Canada, without means. You know all British families placed on farms by the Immigration Department are placed there with the assistance of \$1,500 from the Imperial Government?

Mr. ARTHURS: How many have you placed there?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I do not know how many, but we have placed 3,000 anyway.

WITNESS: There were 170 in Manitoba last year, I think.

Mr. ARTHURS: Your whole scheme was 3,000.

WITNESS: Permission is given, even if you do not put them on the land, for families to come in who have no way of establishing themselves.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. If you say "permission from London is given" I will stop?—A. Is not that part of the problem, that people are allowed to come in, encouraged to come in? I do not say the Department encourages them, but people are allowed to come in and go on the land who have no knowledge of the conditions. It is all right to encourage them to come, if you are going to give them something when you get them here, but it is not fair to the people, to ask them to come and not do anything for them when they come here.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. Do you mean, the men who come out as operators on the land, or as farm labourers?—A. The man who goes on a farm as a farm labourer is a single man and that complicates the winter situation, as he comes into the city in the winter time and hesitates to go back afterwards. Where can the married men with children go, with work for the summer only? Nobody wants them, when they have one or two children.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. Are you suggesting that we are having too much immigration?—A. I say that we have immigration in the West that is not being assimilated.

Q. Too much?—A. I am not suggesting too much, but I am suggesting that there is more than is being provided for.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. British, or foreign?—A. Both.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. From the standpoint of the farmer, our biggest problem is, to get the kind of help we need?—A. Quite right. If you do not take that into consideration when you let them in, as to whether they are going to fit in, you are bound to have complications as to whether they will or will not fit.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. Do you suggest that there should be a rigid examination before they come in?—A. Absolutely.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. You do not think it should be made easier to get by the examination?—A. I certainly do not.

Q. You were asked to give the Committee the number of cases you dealt with, and separate them into assisted passages and otherwise, and I think it was the intention at first to ask for all cases, British and foreign?—A. Yes, two groups, British and foreign born.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. I would also suggest that they should be initial applications, not the second, third and fourth of the same applications?—A. Applications that were new last year?

Q. No, which were new in the first place?—A. What do you mean by new in the first place?

Q. You said you had the same applications year after year?—A. Yes.

Q. You should not include those?—A. We call them line applications, it they come back. You want the first ones.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You would not advocate paying their passages from the British Isles, whether farm labourers or otherwise?—A. No, but what are you going to do with them?

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Taking into consideration that less than 5 per cent of the population of the British Isles are agriculturists, we cannot put on a very strenuous campaign in order to bring them over here; do you see that?—A. I do not see how you can, unless you are going to make some provision for them. What provision can you make?

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Your suggestion is that the country should provide work?—A. It is not an ideal condition, it is not going to help the country if you take the money from one group to keep another group.

MR. WOODSWORTH: As representing Winnipeg constituency, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that Miss Childs does not represent a voluntary organization, but a Commission appointed by the City Council of Winnipeg. I just want to make that clear.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to ask Miss Childs any questions?

MR. WOODSWORTH: No. I only want to make it clear that it is not a voluntary society, it is the City of Winnipeg itself.

HON. MR. FORKE: I was on a public Commission out there for two years or more, and I found the same problem there then as you have now.

WITNESS: It is not getting any less.

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. No, it is not getting any less?—A. Do we have to continue to have these problems?

Q. I think so. You will always have flotsam and jetsam of humanity, though I think it is established that Winnipeg gets more than her share?—A. Winnipeg does get more than her share, but I do not see why we should carry more than our share. I think special provision should be made if we have a special situation, to meet it, and not to leave it upon one group, as it is at the present time.

Q. Do you realize that thousands and thousands of dollars come into Winnipeg with these people, every year?—A. I have not seen them.

Q. Every man is writing out cheques to go to Winnipeg?

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Could you include in those statistics the repeaters?—A. Yes.

Q. The number that came, for instance in 1924, that were there in 1923; I just want to see whether it is a whole new group coming over, or a brand new lot?—A. Of course you are bound to have a certain group which come from year to year.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Some reference was made to the Brown boys, who would not accept work outside the city, and you were not able to get them work in the city; could those men be deported?—A. They have not yet acquired Canadian domicile. There you are up against another proposition; the reason those boys do not want to go to the country is that they consider that the wages they could earn in the country are very small, and they feel that if they work for six months out of the year in the city at \$70 or \$80 a month they will be farther ahead of the game than if they work in the country at \$40 a month the year round. They have not had any farm experience, and perhaps it might be difficult to get a farmer who would have them.

Q. But have you any suggestions for dealing with such cases? I am sure that I as one member of the Committee would like to hear them?—A. What I want to know is, what is going to happen if you are going to continue to bring families in to swell your city population, if you have no way of spreading them out through the country?

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I do not think the trouble in Winnipeg arises so much from people who come out to go on the land and go there and then come back again as from a class of people who come out with two or three of a family. They come out in the summer time, when things are booming, get a few months' work in Winnipeg, then they get a little house in Winnipeg and are located there; and the first thing you know, a slack time comes and they are stranded; they have their wives and families there, and they are in a situation in which they cannot get enough work to go out to the country and keep their families in Winnipeg. I know exactly the situation in Winnipeg.—A. In the month of November we had 30 families referred to us who had blown into the city and made application almost immediately upon getting in. There was one family with 11, another with 9, and another with 13 children, and they came to us, living in one room.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Good settlers?—A. Good settlers for the country, but not for city life, and, as I say, it is a big problem.

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

By Mr. Fanscher:

Q. Under what circumstances do they come in, assisted passages?—A. I could not tell you the details, whether on assisted passage or not. They did not make good in the country. They got into difficulties and the logical thing was to sell out what they had and come into Winnipeg.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Did those families go and settle in the city or in the country, in farming districts?—A. They came and settled in the country, but could not make it go.

Q. You made a statement there about settlers with large families in the country; can you back that up; do you say that one of those families with 11 or 13 children could go out into the country and make a success of it?—A. They would have a better chance of getting along, of raising foodstuffs, than they would have in the city.

Q. Would they have a better chance still with three or four?—A. That is a different proposition.

Q. I hear a lot of people say that they can get along better, but I have not heard it said of a family of twelve or thirteen?—A. Well, that is a pretty large size. An old fashioned family in the country were all right, and I do not see why they should not be again. The labour is there provided you can get the boys.

Q. There are changes in the country just as well as in the city?—A. Yes.

Q. I am simply combating the suggestion that people with twelve or thirteen children are the best settlers to bring in here. I doubt that very much?—A. I do not say that they are the best to bring in. It is a pretty big proposition.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. As a matter of fact, a family with ten or twelve children cannot get away from the United States as easily as a family with no children?—A. No.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether Miss Childs has finished her statement to the Committee or presented all the letters she wishes.

WITNESS: I think I have presented all the letters the Committee are interested in. It is just a question of the different groups.

Mr. COOTE: I would suggest that the rest be attached to the record.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. These are your own letters?—A. These are copies from the file, but I am told that they can be returned, so it is quite all right.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand that it is the wish of the Committee to have all these letters printed?

Mr. ARTHURS: I think so.

Mr. BROWN: I do not see any object in printing letters referring to general conditions of matters carried on in the city of Winnipeg. In so far as they have reference to questions of immigration they might be printed.

Mr. MCGIBBON: I think they bring out the facts and that they should be printed.

Mr. ARTHURS: We should have the evidence as contained in these letters whether it depends on immigration or not, and I think the balance of the letters that Miss Childs was prepared to go ahead with until she was interrupted by myself and others should be placed on the record.

Mr. KAY: I do not see the purpose of putting all these letters in.

WITNESS: These are a few that were picked out to be read. There is no suggestion that this whole file should go in.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I think the statistics are useful and should go in.

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. The letters that are to be put in are simply cases of those that have presented themselves to your Department?—A. Yes, and who make the problem.

Q. The problem is in the number that come, rather than in the individual case?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: It is the wish of the Committee to have them printed; I understand?

Mr. ARTHURS: Yes.

Mr. COOTE: I suggest that we have printed only those that Miss Childs would like. If she thinks they should all be printed, all right. If she thinks some may be omitted, perhaps she will select those that should be printed.

WITNESS: These may be boiled down to one or two of each group. I have them under the group of those who came in past the age when they ever could become self-supporting; those who had mental or physical difficulties; and then the group which did not become adjusted. They can be boiled down to two of each.

Mr. COOTE: That would meet the purpose of the Committee, I think.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Will Miss Childs select them for the Committee.

Mr. KAY: Would you be good enough in those cases to state whether or not they are "assisted passages."

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: If there is nothing else, I move that the Committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will adjourn until to-morrow at eleven o'clock when the witnesses will be Mr. Chamberlain, President of the British Welfare League and Mr. Farthing, representing the Legion. Miss Childs, allow me to thank you for your evidence in an interrupted afternoon.

Witness retired.

The following letters were submitted by Miss Childs to be placed on record:

GROUP 1

Illustrating cases of those who were old, but were allowed into Canada when passed the stage in life when they could make any provision for themselves.

"December 16, 1927.

"Mr. T. GELLEY,
Division Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
Winnipeg.

"Dear Mr. GELLEY: Re Charles and Biena Glenn, Marjorie, 1903—197
Polson Avenue.

"We would be glad of your advice on the following case:—

"Charles Glenn was born in 1854, at Iowa, U.S.A., and in 1893 went to California, where he lived until 1918, when he came to Canada, to Stonewall, Manitoba, coming to this city in 1920, at the age of 64. His wife was born in Ontario, and went to California in 1898; was married there, and her two children were born and educated there.

"In 1921 this family received assistance from the Unemployment Relief Department. In 1925, 1 cord of wood was supplied by the Social Welfare Commission, and on 12th December, 1927, groceries, bread and

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

milk were supplied by Social Welfare Commission, on account of the son having left home, and only the daughter of 24, earning \$48 at the Fashion Craft Store.

"This family are paying \$25 a month for their house, which, according to our budget for three people, is too high a rent. The daughter, Marjorie, has now a baby to support, the father of whom is a married man, against whom she refuses to testify. This child, should Marjorie be unemployed at any time, might become a public charge.

"Mr. Glenn himself is beyond the age for any steady employment, and is over-age for work in the City Wood Yard. The family came into Canada in a car, for which they had to pay \$80, and therefore sold this car.

"As this man has lived in California for twenty-five years, and is an American citizen, we would appreciate if you would inform us if this family is eligible for deportation.

"Thanking you, we are,

Yours very truly,

Secretary.

"February 21st, 1928.

"Mr. THOMAS GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
C.P.R. Building, City.

Re Mrs. Henrietta Elder, 410 Bannatyne Ave.

"DEAR SIR,—Following our conversation of February 17th, regarding Mrs. Elder of the above address, we beg to advise you of the following facts: Mrs. Elder was born in Edinburgh, Scotland, on December 13th, 1868, and before her marriage was a dressmaker. Her marriage took place on November 15th, 1888, in Edinburgh, to Mr. Thomas Elder, who died in 1906, leaving Mrs. Elder with nine children, eight girls and one boy. The latter was born seven months after Mr. Elder's death, and has since died.

"Little or nothing was left to the widow, and she had a daughter, Mrs. Edwin Sholte, living at Lac Pelletier, Sask., to whom she came to this country with the expectation of making her home with her. Mrs. Elder landed in Quebec on August 8th, 1925, sailing from Glasgow on the ss. *Metagama*. From Quebec she travelled via C.P.R. to Swift Current, Saskatchewan, which is a short distance from Lac Pelletier. She remained only five months here on account of her physical condition, as the high altitude affected her eyes and ears, and she suffered a slight stroke, losing her speech for several days. In the beginning of 1926, Mrs. Elder's son-in-law, Mr. Sholte, paid her fare of about \$15 in to Winnipeg, and her first address was with a friend of her daughter, Mrs. Coward, 794 Beverley street. At present she is living at the above address, 410 Bannatyne avenue.

"Mrs. Elder has two daughters in the Old Country, Miss Jean Elder, 59 Comely Bank avenue, Edinburgh, Scotland, and Miss Dorothy Elder, c/o "Milne", 40 Victoria Road, Upper Norwood, London, S.E. 19, who send her money monthly. The first named sends her ten shillings every two weeks, and the latter sends \$6 per month, and this is what she has paid her board with and had had to live on. She has a diamond tie pin

belonging to her deceased husband which she pawned and later redeemed and has again pawned it to make ends meet. She had twenty-five cents while in the office.

"An order of groceries, bread and milk was sent Mrs. Elder on February 17th.

"We believe it was your intention to write to Mr. Edwin Sholte. This is for your information.

"Yours truly,

"SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,
Per
Secretary."

GROUP 2

"December 13, 1927.

"Mr. T. GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Winnipeg, Man.

*Re Mike Szabo, 45; Helen Szabo, 42; John Szabo, 15; Anthony Szabo, 12;
Helen Szabo, 10; Charles Szabo, 8; Frank Szabo, 5; Louis Szabo, 3.
82 Lorne St.*

"Dear Sir,—

"We beg to draw your attention to the above-named family, who came to Winnipeg from Hungary in July, 1926, landing from the *Ascania* about the 28th of the month.

"The man states that he has only been able to obtain twenty days' work during the summer and has applied for relief. We have supplied him with food and fuel temporarily, pending adjustment, and should be glad if you would place him in work.

"For your information,

"Yours truly,

"SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION.
Secretary."

"Dec. 9th, 1927.

"Mr. THOMAS GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
C.P.R. Building, City.

*Re Mrs. Adelaide Cawton or Cotton, 373 Graham avenue; Elizabeth,
born in 1914; Albert, born on Jan. 4, 1918.*

"DEAR SIR,—We beg to draw your attention to Mrs. Cawton living in one room at 373 Graham avenue, since November 1, 1926. She and her husband, Mr. William Cawton, with their two children, sailed from Liverpool on May 25th, 1922, for Canada on the ss. *Montrose*, arriving in Quebec about June 3rd, 1922. They travelled westward by the C.P.R. to Port Arthur where Mrs. Cawton has a sister, Mrs. James Wilson, 91 Crown street. Mr. Cawton worked there on the C.N.R. as a labourer in the roundhouse for three years, but fearing that there was not a good future ahead of him in Canada, the C.N.R. gave him a pass over their railway as far as Quebec, and he paid his own passage on the boat back to England. He is now working for the Steel, Peach Tozer Company, Sheffield, in the test house, and his address is No. 12, Hat, 3rd Avenue,

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

Tinsley, Sheffield. Mr. Cawton has been working for this company for the past three months and is now writing for his wife and two children to join him, realizing that he is in a position to care for them if they were in England.

"Mrs. Cawton's maiden name was Adelaide Critchley, and she was born on June 8th, 1889 in Cheshire, England, of English parentage, and was married to Mr. Cawton on January 5th, 1907, at Attercliffe Church, Sheffield. There are two children, Elizabeth, born in 1914, and Albert, born in 1918, who are with Mrs. Cawton at the present time.

"Mr. Cawton was born on June 1st, 1885, in West Yorkshire, England, and after leaving school, he worked in the coal mines until he joined up with the King's Own Light Infantry as a reservist in 1914 until the end of the war. He is in receipt of a pension of twenty-two shillings per week.

"On returning to England from Canada in May 1926 Mr. Cawton had five shillings of pension allotted to Mrs. Cawton.

"While in Port Arthur Mrs. Cawton worked in the Acme Laundry, and after coming to Winnipeg in October 1926 she secured work with the North-West Laundry, but unfortunately in May 1927 she had blood poisoning in the right leg and was a patient in Victoria Hospital from May 28th, 1927 until September 7th, 1927, under the care of Dr. A. J. Davidson. As soon as he partially recovered she returned to the North-West Laundry and was there until November 8th, 1927. At the present time she is working for the New Method Laundry, sometimes two days and sometimes four days per week, but owing to the condition of her leg she is likely to be laid off at any time as there is still an open sore, and the probability is that she would soon become a public charge.

"There is a hospital bill of \$85.75 which was incurred by Mrs. Cawton and Elizabeth while patients in Victoria Hospital. This bill has been referred to the city for payment.

"Medical report on Mrs. Cawton from Dr. A. J. Davidson will follow.

"This is for your information.

"Your truly,

"SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,

Per

Secretary."

"Jan. 27, 1927.

"Mr. Thomas GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
Winnipeg, Man.

"DEAR SIR:

Re: *James Myles and wife, 627 Anderson Avenue.*

"We would like to bring to your notice, the case of the above-named man and his wife who came to Winnipeg from Scotland in May, 1925.

"Mr. Myles is 42 years of age and has practically had no work since coming to this country, with the exception of a few odd jobs. His last employment was with the Advance Rumley Co., where he was laid off through slack times and his last pay was \$33.00 on the 1st of December 1926. His full earnings since January, 1926 have only amounted to \$150.00.

"Mr. and Mrs. Myles are living in one furnished, heated room, for which they are paying \$10.00 per month. They have no debts and no creditors. Mrs. Myles is delicate and unable to go out to work.

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

"We visited Mrs. Myles on the 24th of January but she objected to her case being investigated as they do not want relief. Mr. Myles is most anxious for work of some kind and we would be very glad if you would see this man and try to get some work for him.

"As they have no children, Mr. Myles cannot be put on work in the woodyard, or on crushed stone work, and they have no relatives in this country who can assist them.

"We would much appreciate if you will see what you can do for Mr. Myles in the way of getting employment for him.

"Thanking you, we are,

"Yours truly,

"SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,

Per

Secretary."

"DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

WINNIPEG, Manitoba, February 5th, 1927.

"MADAM,—Yours of the 27th ultimo, *re* James Myles and wife, 627 Anderson Avenue received.

"If this couple is prepared to go as farm help and render suitable service as such, I am prepared to place them at once. In the meantime to help as far as possible, I am asking Mrs. M. Lewis, 98 Coborg Avenue, Elmwood, Winnipeg, to call and see this couple, and see what can be done for them.

"You will hear further from me as soon as I receive Mrs. Lewis' report.

"Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) THOMAS GELLEY,

Division Commissioner.

Miss GERTRUDE CHILDS,

Secretary Social Welfare Commission,

Civic Offices, Market Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

"WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, Friday, 9th, 1927

"DEAR MADAM: "As advised in my letter to you of the 5th instant, in the case of James Myles and wife, 627 Anderson Avenue, City, I have had Mrs. Lewis call upon this couple and she reports that Mr. Myles has secured temporary employment at the Tribune Newspaper Building, and that the Advance Rumley Company were well satisfied with Mr. Myles former service with them, and have promised to take him on again whenever it is possible to do so.

"Mr. Myles is a blacksmith by trade, Mrs. Lewis reports that Mrs. Myles is not at all strong looking and feels sure that farm work would be out of the question, and also that her husband is entirely without experience in that line of work.

"Mrs. Lewis means to keep in touch with this couple and assist them in every way possible towards their permanent establishment at satisfactory work.

"Your obedient servant,

"(Sgd.) THOMAS GELLEY,

"Division Commissioner

"Miss G. CHILDS, Secretary, Social Welfare Commission,
Civic Offices, Market Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba."

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

GROUP 3

Cases of people intended for country work, but who remained in the city.

"JANUARY 26, 1927.

"MR. THOS. GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
Winnipeg, Man.

"DEAR SIR: *Re* John and Emma Mueller, alias Miller, 162 Higgins Avenue (upstairs).

"This family consists of the above-named and their two children, John and Charlie. They applied for assistance owing to unemployment and owing to the fact that they had no supplies and we therefore, sent them an emergency order earlier in the month.

"They came to Canada from Bfelsdorf, District of Zurick, on the 10th of July, 1923, having landed in Quebec via the steamship Ansonia, and travelled inland via the Canadian National Railways. For eighteen months they lived at Newdale, Man., and for over a year farmed around Libau, Man. They came to Winnipeg in April, 1926, were self-supporting while Mr. Mueller was able to find work in the city, but now that he is unemployed they were obliged to apply for assistance from the Social Welfare Commission.

"In view of the fact that they are non-residents we offered transportation to Libau which they declined to accept.

"We wish to mention that Mrs. Mueller has a very prominent goitre for which she has never had medical attention. She had this goitre in the Old Country which disappeared but came back since her arrival in Canada.

"For your information

"Yours truly,

Secretary."

"FEBRUARY 2, 1927.

"MR. THOMAS GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
Winnipeg, Man.

DEAR SIR: *Re* Julia Kaczkowski, 139 Jarvis Avenue.

"Mr. Zogliniski has spoken to you regarding arrangements for the burial of the above, who died in St. Boniface Hospital.

"She came to this country on the Steamship *Pennland*, landing in Halifax, July 10, 1926, and we understand that she was brought in on an affidavit signed by someone; that her Passport states she is a farm labourer, and that regardless of this, she lived in the city during the period of time she was in Canada.

"In view of the fact that it is the policy of the City of Winnipeg not to accept responsibility for immigrants who have been in Canada less than one year, we are referring this to you for arrangements for her burial.

"Should you desire to avail yourself of the contract price for burial as arranged by this department with the Undertakers of the City, we shall be glad to arrange this for you, on a written request, with guarantee of payment.

"Yours truly,

Secretary."

" March 16, 1927.

" Mr. THOS. GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall,
Winnipeg, Man.

" DEAR SIR:

Re Jacob and Helena Schwarz, 627 St. John's Ave.

" The above-named family came from Yugoslavia sailing on the ss. *Bremen*, and arriving on May 18, 1924. This family was supposed to work for a farmer in Saskatchewan, according to the Affidavit which was sent to him by his uncle from Winnipeg, and he arrived in Winnipeg and has lived here ever since.

" When he first arrived he worked for Gordon, Ironside's, which is now the Harris Abattoir, for a year, and for the last two years for Shea's Brewery. He took sick and, according to the medical report, he is suffering from Tuberculosis of the kidney and bladder. Duration of illness indefinite, and the doctor recommends that he be sent to Ninette Sanatorium and he will not be able to do any work for two or three years and possibly never.

" This medical report is signed by Dr. Donald F. McIntyre, and dated March 12th, 1927.

" Mrs. Schwarz is now under the doctor's care and is suspected to be suffering from Tuberculosis too.

" Mr. Schwarz was a member of the Austrian-German-Hungarian Club and his family will receive \$6 per week for ten weeks, the following ten weeks \$3 per week, and then the benefit will cease.

" As Mr. Schwarz has been sick for some time now, he was obliged to apply for assistance which was granted by this office and his wife and one child is on relief at the present time.

" We may say that one of Mr. Schwarz' kidneys has been removed.
" For your information.

" Yours truly,

" SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,
" Per *Secretary*."

GROUP 4—" POOR CITIZENS "

" WINNIPEG, January 31, 1927.

" Mr. THOS. GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall, City.

" DEAR SIR:

" Re Polly Semowinczuk, alias Maniuk, 55 Martha St.

" We beg to refer the above-named case to the attention of your department, for consideration of her return to the old country.

" Mrs. Semowinczuk first became known to our Commission December 21, 1925, when she applied to us for assistance. We find that she was of Galician parentage, born in 1878. She gave us a history of having been married in the old country in January, 1898; that she left her husband and came out to Canada in 1908. On arrival here she worked in

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

restaurants for a while, and up to the time of the war, she claims to have sent her husband \$900. In 1914, she met and lived with a John Maniuk for seven years. As she found that he drank, she left him and took in another man, by the name of George Greenhall, an Englishman, who she claims was also a drunkard. As she found she had to support both these men, she left them.

"This woman has a Police record. On November 8, 1923, she was convicted of a breach of the Manitoba Temperance Act and fined \$50 and costs; the same on June 9, 1924, and the same on May 29, 1925. On August 21, 1925, she was sentenced to three months' imprisonment. This woman has been a continual source of trouble to the authorities for her persistent bootlegging activities. Her residence became a resort for thieves, to whom home-brew was plentifully supplied. When she was imprisoned, her children (all illegitimate), John, born 1912, Stephen, 1916, and George (Greenhall) born 1923, were committed to the custody of the Children's Aid Society on December 1, 1926, for six months. Since that date, Mrs. Semowinczuk has been endeavouring to get her children back, but each time the case has come up in Court, there are no facts to prove that she would be a capable mother to the children, and they are still in the custody of the Juvenile Court.

"We are herewith enclosing a mental report on Mrs. Semowinczuk, signed by Dr. A. T. Mathers, from the contents of which it appears that she came to this country as a mental defective, and that, as such, could be under consideration for return. Mrs. Semowinczuk gives her husband's address in Poland as Jacob Semowinczuk, Dzuiriw, Sniatyn, Popilnica, Poland.

"As far as can be ascertained, the facts of her arrival here are as follows:

"She sailed from Antwerp about August 9, 1910, on the S.S. 'Montezuima', and landed at Quebec about August 21st, coming inland by C.P.R.

"Trusting to hear from you as soon as possible, we are.

"Yours truly,

"SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,

"Per Secretary."

"WINNIPEG, December 7, 1927.

Mr. THOS. GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall, Winnipeg, Man.

"DEAR SIR:

"*Re Loffler, 62 Argyle Street.*

"This case was referred to us by Mr. Paul de Marik, Secretary to the Hungarian Consul, Royal Bank Building, Winnipeg.

"He told us that the family has already been referred to your department and that Mr. Anton Loffler is said to be a tailor by trade, and that he came from the City of Mincent, District of Basuniat, Hungary. His wife, Annie nee Hell, whom he married in 1923 (in the old country) stated that he has never done any work on a farm, and that he bribed the official in the old country, when he applied for his Passport, to record his occupation as farmer.

"The couple arrived in Canada on the 6th of June, 1926, on the steamship Alaunia, Landing Sheet No. 18, Line No. 1 and 2, respectively.

"We enclose herewith Hungarian Passport with a signed Affidavit, for your information.

"Mrs. Loffler told us her husband had deserted on Nov. 5th, having eloped with her step-mother, Mrs. Andrew Hell, and at the present time the two are supposed to be at Weyburn, Sask.

"The couple arrived in Canada with Mr. Andrew Hell a former resident of the United States. The latter brought his second wife, Rose, formerly mentioned, and their children, Andrew and Joseph. Both families lived somewhere in Saskatchewan for a few months after their arrival in Canada and in January, 1927, came to Winnipeg, and have lived at the above address ever since. Mr. Andrew is employed as carpenter somewhere in the city.

"Mrs. Loffler complains that she was left without any means of support and that her father declines to assist her, and she wishes to be cared for by the Social Welfare Commission.

"The Loffler family have become public charges in that Mrs. Loffler gave birth to a child at the Winnipeg General Hospital, where she stayed for twelve days, and her hospital account has not been paid.

"Yours truly,

"SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,
"Per Secretary."

GROUP 5—"THE UNFIT"

WINNIPEG, January 26th, 1927.

"MR. THOS. GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall, C.P.R. Building, City.

"DEAR SIR:

"RE: Charles & Dorothy Albon,
279 Assiniboine Avenue.

"We beg to draw your attention to the above-named family.

"Mr. Albon was born in 1902, in London, England, of English parentage, Roman Catholic faith. He had a public school education and several terms at university. He joined the Royal Engineers, regimental number 613882, and was demobilized on August 2, 1920. He next joined the Royal Irish Constabulary on Oct. 5, 1920, regimental number 73899, and was demobilized in 1922. He was in receipt of a pension of twelve shillings per week owing to an injury to his left elbow, received while with the latter regiment, but before coming to Canada he assigned the said pension to his widowed mother, Mrs. Collins, 2, Cronin Road, London, S.E. His mother is now deceased but the pension is being paid over to a young sister, Alice Albon, 14 years of age.

"Mr. Albon sailed on the *Empress of Scotland* from Southampton, arriving at Quebec in June, 1924, travelling via the C.P.R. direct to Winnipeg. He joined the C.E.F. at Tuxedo, but was discharged in August, 1925, as medically unfit. Since that time he has been employed as a waiter at the C.N.R., also at the Harris-Abattoir Company as a painter. He was also employed by the T. Eaton Co., and was for a time employed as news-agent at the C.P.R. At the present time he is unemployed and has applied at our office for assistance.

"Dorothy White, born in 1903, at Exmouth, England. Her mother re-married and was residing in Greenoch, and from this port Dorothy White sailed on the ss. *Ruthenia* for Canada, arriving in October, 1924, travelling via the C.N.R. to Winnipeg. For a short time she lived at

[Miss Gertrude Childs.]

the Canadian Women's Hostel, and from there secured a position as domestic at the Municipal Hospital, where she was until she was married to Mr. Albon on Sept. 4, 1926. Marriage has been verified at St. Mary's Parish House, ceremony being performed by the Rev. Father Luty.

"We might say that there is a child named Dorothy at the present time living with a Mrs. Evans, whom Mr. Albon admitted belonged to him, being born in England out of lawful wedlock. The unmarried mother and child followed Mr. Albon from England to Canada, and she is now married under the name of Evans, but the address given to us, 592 Beverley street, is incorrect.

"Mrs. Albon expects to be confined in February, and arrangements have been made by Dr. J. R. Thomson, 311 Balmoral street, to have her admitted to Victoria Hospital.

"Their rent is behind, and groceries, bread and milk are being supplied at the present time on account of Mrs. Albon's condition.

"This for your information.

"Yours truly,

"SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,
"Per Secretary."

"WINNIPEG, December 3, 1927.

"Mr. THOS. GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall, Winnipeg, Man.

"*Re Max. Kleiman, Hospital for the Insane, Selkirk*

"DEAR SIR:

"The above-named man is married and has two children. His wife and children are at the present time residing at 269 Alfred Ave., Winnipeg.

"This family came to Canada on the "Marburn," landing at Halifax on December 25, 1924. They lived in St. Boniface from the time of their arrival until last May and since then have lived in Winnipeg.

"Mr. Kleiman took sick and was in the Psychopathic Hospital for two months, and was then transferred to the Hospital for the Insane, at Selkirk.

"Mrs. Kleiman has made application for an allowance under the Child Welfare Act, which will be forwarded to the Committee for consideration at their next meeting which will take place during the second week of this month.

"Mrs. Kleiman tells us that Mr. Kleiman had mental trouble in Russia and has had several attacks since his arrival in Canada, the last one being so bad that he had to be taken away.

"We are in possession of the family's Passport and if you wish to see it kindly advise us. We received this from the Medical Supt. of the Hospital for the Insane who, in his letter of Nov. 30th, asked us to return it to him when we are through with it.

"For your information,

"Yours truly,

"SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,

"Per.....
Secretary."

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

" WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, March 9th, 1927.

"MADAM,—Further to my letter of 26th July last, in regard to the case of Ada Waters Hill, your file 15028, I beg to state that a record has now been traced in the Department which would indicate that Mrs. Ada May Hill, housekeeper by occupation, aged 50, widow, born in England, sailed from Liverpool by the S.S. "Empress of Britain" landing at Quebec on September 5th, 1911, destined to two brothers, farmers, at Edson, Alberta, and accompanied by a son, Willie, aged 11.

"There does not appear to be any record in the Department of previous correspondence in her case, nor is there any evidence that a Bond of Indemnity was exacted and it can only be assumed that she passed inspection in the usual way.

"Under the circumstances, it would not appear that she is in any way subject to deportation, as she has undoubtedly long since acquired Canadian domicile.

"Your obedient servant,

(Signed) THOMAS GELLEY,

"Division Commissioner.

"Miss G. CHILDS,
Secretary, Social Welfare Commission,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

WINNIPEG, March 14th, 1927.

"MR. THOS. GELLEY,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Immigration Hall, C.P.R. Building, City.

"DEAR MR. GELLEY:—

"Re Mrs. Ada Waters Hill, 122 Harriet St.

"We beg to advise you that the above-named woman was admitted to the Home at Portage la Prairie, on February 21st, 1927.

"This for your information.

Yours truly,

"SOCIAL WELFARE COMMISSION,
Per Secretary."

The Committee adjourned until 11 o'clock a.m. May 2nd, 1928.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, May 2, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock, a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

ALBERT CHAMBERLAIN called and sworn.

WITNESS (Reading):

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: Having only arrived home a week ago after eight weeks in the Old Country investigating immigration conditions, and not having closely followed your previous sessions, I am at some disadvantage in appearing before you this morning. However, I am glad to offer what information I have concerning the general subject of immigration.

As far as I can gather, this Committee has been appointed to discover what is wrong with immigration, and then to find out what steps might be taken to improve present conditions.

First of all, let me give you my credentials. Many of you do not know me, and will wonder what right I have to give evidence before this Committee.

As President of the British Welcome and Welfare League, of Toronto, I have for twenty years been living among new settlers. More than 100,000 British newcomers have passed through the hands of our institution during those twenty years. At the present time, I interview about 50 newcomers every day. That is 10,000 a year.

I know all about their ambitions, their hopes, their anxieties, their disappointments and their successes. I suppose I have welcomed as many newcomers to Canada as any other single man in this Dominion.—I mean personally welcome them, shaken their hand, helped them find a bed for the night, helped them get work, tided them over tight places, and given them advice and information when they needed it.

I know the British newcomer. That is why I have come before you to-day.

Now, a word or two about the organization I represent. The British Welcome and Welfare League is a public, patriotic, philanthropic, non-denominational institution, with branches in Quebec, Montreal, Oshawa, Hamilton and Windsor. Our purpose is to give a friendly hand of welcome to British newcomers upon their arrival in Canada, to offer them temporary accommodation for a night or two at a nominal cost, and to advise and help them in various ways to become worthy citizens of Canada.

Our work is mainly maintained through public subscriptions and grants from various sources. We occupy a splendid 36-roomed Hostel in Toronto, which we use for our headquarters, which was bought and paid for by the Ontario Government—another effort of Hon. Mr. John Martin, Minister of Immigration—at a cost of \$22,675. I must be very honest and tell you that the Dominion Government has not been so generous. Two years ago we received a grant—and I may say after a

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

lot of trouble in getting it—of \$2,500. Last year we received nothing. This year we asked the Government for \$2,500, and were given \$1,000. This made it necessary for us to curtail our work. Not only that, but the Deputy Minister of Immigration, Mr. Egan, has written to us, advising us that we are not to expect any further financial support from the Federal Government.

In the face of these facts, gentlemen, I would like you to also know that in the city of Toronto our Hostel is the only home for immigrants upon their arrival there. True, there is a home for domestics, but I am referring to newcomers in general now. Settlers by the hundreds are landing in Toronto every week-end, brought out by the Canadian Government. Many are obliged to wait overnight in Toronto. Land Settlement officers bring all such newcomers to our hostel for our care, and still, when we ask for \$2,500, we only receive \$1,000 toward such work.

I must add, however, that we have an arrangement with the Department of Immigration, whereby they pay us 25 cents for each meal and 25 cents for each bed provided to any newcomers who are referred to us by Government officials who are without funds, or who are awaiting deportation. This allowance pays for the actual cost of maintaining such newcomers, but allows nothing for the overhead expenses of our institution.

This Committee will be particularly interested in the immigration work of our League. We call it our "Family Reunion Work."

Briefly here is the scheme in operation: Every year thousands—yes, I suppose scores of thousands—of British men come to Canada, leaving a wife and children in the Old Land. They have every intention of bringing them out later. But what happens? The man eventually gets work, say he earns from \$18 to \$25 a week. He has himself to keep here. If he is any kind of a man he will send money home to support his family. How can that man save \$102.40 to bring his wife and \$51.20 for every child under ten years?

Gentlemen, there are to-day thousands of British men in Canada living apart from their wives and children, an undesirable condition of affairs for the man, the family, for Canada and for the Old Country.

Last year our League brought 800 women and children to Canada and reunited them with their fathers and husbands. Here is how we do it. If any Britisher will come to us, and prove that he is of good moral character, is in employment, has a home ready, and can look after his family when they land, we will bring them to Canada. But first the man must raise half the cost of passage money. We advance the other half, and he repays us at \$5 a week, without a cent of interest.

This year we are going to bring to Canada 1,200 women and children. I brought the first part of 212 myself, arriving last Thursday. We had a special train meet us at Quebec, a telegram was sent to the fathers, and I conducted them right through to their destinations, in Oshawa, Toronto, Hamilton, London, Brantford, and Windsor, etc.

Gentlemen, I do not know of any finer immigration policy than that, the reunion of families. I do not know of any scheme which has proven so successful. A man is here waiting for his people, he is in employment, a home is ready, and a friendly society is prepared to organize everything properly.

Somebody might say, "1,200 people is a drop in the bucket; what Canada needs is people by the millions." Well, there are differences of opinion regarding that. Chief Justice Sir William Mulock was not far wrong when he said, "better have a vacant house than a bad tenant." Canada needs population, yes, but we must always consider quality

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

before quantity. And as Britishers in Canada we ought to demand that the influx of settlers from Europe should at no time be permitted to exceed the numbers of British settler-immigrants.

The secretary of our institution, who is beside me, was at Quebec a week ago, and personally watched six ocean liners land about 4,500 immigrants—he is backed up by one of the Government officials; I will not mention his name, but if necessary, I will give it.—He tells me that from 75 per cent to 80 per cent of the new arrivals were non-Anglo-Saxon. And despite the fact that the railway companies are supposedly bringing people from the preferred countries, that is, from Holland, Sweden, and Germany, the large majority of those who landed a week ago were from Central and Southern Europe.

Canada must not become another "melting-pot." We must keep Canada British. What is the solution? I know it is not an easy task, this immigration business. On the one hand manufacturers and public speakers call for increased immigration. On the other, labour councils and social service bodies demand tight restrictions. Some say to limit Canada to only the British, and others say that the west will never become populated unless we admit the foreigners.

I have no ready-made solution, but I have one little suggestion. I have just been in conference with Lord Lovat, chairman of the Overseas Settlement Committee of the British Government. I told him about our family reunion work, and this is what he said: "The British Government is prepared to financially assist the British Welcome and Welfare League's family reunion work if the Canadian or Ontario Governments will share the cost of a fifty-fifty basis.

Gentlemen our League could bring 50,000 British women and children to Canada within one year if we had the required financial support. And I will be very frank and say that if the Canadian or Ontario Government turn down the offer of the British Government, then it would appear that they do not want Britishers in Canada. A satisfied settler is Canada's best advertisement. One letter from a contented settler counts more than a thousand. I say look after the newcomer until he gets his feet firmly planted in Canada, and then Canada will attract the finest stock of the British Isles.

I am firmly convinced that one of the chief obstacles in the way of increased immigration is the high ocean rate, which is three times higher than before the war. Reduced rates are only available to farm workers and household servants.

But is it true, gentlemen, that opportunities in Canada exist for only these two classes? I grant that labour conditions at the present do not warrant any large influx of unskilled labourers, but this is what I do say; there ought to be some financial assistance available to help British women and children join their husbands and fathers in Canada, providing they are in employment and can take care of them.

Let me say in passing that the Hon. John Martin, who came to the station to meet us, said that he never saw a brighter lot of immigrants coming to this Dominion.

I am sure you will agree that the 217 women and children we brought to Canada last week are just as valuable an asset to Canada as 217 farm workers or household servants. And I am positive that they are as valuable as the whole 2,500 or more Russians, Hungarians, Poles and whatnot who landed at Quebec when I did.

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

When I arrived in England I found awaiting seventy letters from people in the Old Country, inviting me to meet them; I also found a letter from the Prime Minister, Mr. King, asking if I would make some inquiries regarding the new medical regulations. Let me say in passing that I thought that was a good place to ask the question. What do you think of the new regulations? They were all against it except one lady, who said she would rather wait to see how they worked out. I have my report here, and I am going to read it, with your consent, Mr. Chairman:

I visited large centres, and several smaller towns and counties, and interviewed most of the leading men interested in immigration.

I discovered that the new regulations were thoroughly condemned by everyone I talked with, with the exception of Dr. Jeffis, who is supervising the Canadian doctors now engaged by the Canadian Government.

While most of those I talked with approve of the theory of the new regulations . . . they disapprove of the way in which the regulations are being enforced. True, it is a new scheme, and will require time to become perfected.

While in London I addressed a meeting at the Royal Colonial Institute. There were present 22 persons representing various migration societies. I asked for an expression of opinion on the new regulations, and everyone present were against it.

Here are some of the reasons why British people object to the new regulations.

1. It goes against the grain of British people to be examined by young Canadian doctors.

2. Despite the statement that the new examination is free of charge, the applicant is put to just as great an expense, if not more. In the first place he must pay about 5 shillings for a photograph, and more if he has a family. Then there is the rail fare to and from the place of examination.

3. One of the greatest objections seems to be that applicants must journey to a certain town, on a certain day, at a certain time. Perhaps a day's pay is lost in getting there.

4. At Southampton complaints were made that a party of intending immigrants had travelled to Southampton . . . only to find that the lady doctor did not turn up.

5. It is claimed that it is impossible for 65 Canadian doctors to do the work that had been previously done by 1,500 local doctors.

6. There can be no doubt that the new regulations slow up immigration. Take this concrete example: The British Welcome and Welfare League had organized a party of 350 British women and children to sail on April 13th. Only 212 sailed. The rest were not ready in sufficient time. It is likely that they will sail with our next party on May 11th . . . but many of them will change their minds, and not come to Canada at all. What about those people who have no relatives in Canada? Such regulations would immediately turn them towards Australia.

7. In taking away the work from the 1,500 Roster Doctors . . . Canada has created 1,500 Doctors who certainly are not feeling very kindly towards the Dominion.

8. Personally I feel that the examining of intending settlers should be carried on under the control of the Department of Immigration and not the Department of Health. Petty jealousies and contentions between the heads of the departments is not a good thing for immigration.

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

9. It is proposed to have the Medical Staff Headquarters in the New Sun Life Building adjoining the Canadian Building. In my opinion, it should be under the same roof as the Department of Immigration.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Would you mind repeating that?—A. It is proposed to have a Medical Staff Headquarters in the new Sun Life Building adjoining the Canadian Building. In my opinion, it should be under the same roof as the Department of Immigration. Better to have it under one roof and under one head.

10. The feeling in Great Britain towards Canada is decidedly cold at the moment. It is felt that Canada does not want Britishers. The whole movement of British immigration needs to be shaken up and re-organized.

Let me say that this is my twelfth trip to the Old Country. I have been following it up a great many years, and I know something about the feeling of the Old Country towards Canada.

It is felt that passengers who pay their own fare, and who have funds of their own, should not be subjected to the same examination as settlers who are being financially assisted by governments.

A great deal has been said about that in the Old Country.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: That is not true.

WITNESS: It is the same examination.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: No; the man who pays his own way does not need to be examined at all.

WITNESS: At the port, he does.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Suppose a man is well off, with a family, and he has money; he says he has made up his mind to go to Canada, he has to go through and await his turn just the same as if he were being assisted by the government.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. If a man is well off, should he not be examined?—A. He should be examined, but he should be examined by his own local doctor.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Let us have this cleared up. A man who is coming to Canada at his own expense can go forward, but the Steamship Companies know full well that if he fails to pass at Quebec, they have to take him back, therefore they have to have them examined before going aboard the ship?—A. Let me read No. 12:

While it is true that full fare passengers may now be examined at the port of embarkation instead of going to a nearby town for examination, the new regulations which are so strict have frightened many people from attempting to sail. They will not take the risk of going to the port to be examined there.

13. It is complained that the Canadian Doctors now in Great Britain are not co-operating with the local shipping agents in the towns and cities. The shipping agents feel this keenly.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: I do not say anything about that.

WITNESS:

It is my opinion that the 1,500 Roster doctors should be reinstated, to conduct examinations under the new regulations, and that supervising these 1,500 Old Country Doctors should be a Board of Canadians, who

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

would be called for their advice in doubtful cases, and who would strike off any Roster Doctor who permitted anyone to sail for Canada who was unfit.

I think, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have talked long enough.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Before you leave that, I did not follow you very carefully; is that last clause your suggestion?—A. In the last clause, yes, that is my suggestion.

Q. Your own personal suggestion?—A. Yes. Let me say, it would not be very hard, if a local doctor, an English doctor or a Scotch doctor, did not do his duty. Suppose he passed candidates for Canada who were not suitable for Canada, it would be easy to ascertain, when those men are in this country, who passed them, and if you found a doctor who passed a certain man, let two or three Canadian doctors say, "This man is no good, strike him off the list." You can easily find out who is not doing his duty. In that way you will get more people to come to Canada than at the present time.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, for hearing me. I do not know that I have anything more to say, but I should be glad to answer any questions that anyone may ask me about my experience, which I may say is an experience covering twenty years.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. What would you do with those who have been already let into this country if they were not suited?—A. If they were not suited, I would send them back again, deport them.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. I think, Mr. Chamberlain, the first reason you gave was the objection of the British people to being examined by Canadian doctors?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that not due to the superiority complex which characterizes the British?—A. I quite agree with that.

Q. That we are in a position of inferiority?—A. I agree with that.

MR. BROWN: That is undoubtedly the reason; whether it is wise for us to yield to that is a question of policy. I take it that were it not for that attitude towards the examiners, many of the other difficulties would disappear, but with that superiority complex naturally they are antagonistic towards all other features of the examination. That appears to be the situation.

WITNESS: You will never knock out that John Bull feeling that Jack is as good as his master. I came to Canada fifty years ago, as an immigrant, and I had that spirit at that time, and I still have it. I believe I am as good as any Canadian, and yet I am a real British Canadian; I have not lost my John Bull.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. What I want to get your opinion about is this; all these changes in the regulations, the sending of Canadian doctors to examine—and I want to stress that point particularly—those who are to receive assistance to migrate; if that is not working out successfully, with your knowledge, would you then suggest that we return to the old state of affairs, because I want to stress the point that every change in the regulations, every move we have made in that direction has been for the purpose of assisting and creating a new interest in this British emigration. Now if we have gone wrong in that direction, would you say let us get back to the old system? Would it be wise to return to the old system?—A. Yes. I am quite sincere in saying that I think the old system was very much preferable to the present system. In the first place, you have 1,500 doctors helping you

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

to send people to Canada. If they send people who are not fit, you can speedily find them out, and strike such doctors off the list. I do think, however, that the Canadian Government should have two or three Canadian doctors to supervise, and let them be the final judges; that is, if a case comes up in which a decision has to be made, let two or three Canadian doctors make that decision.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Would that not mean more delay?—A. Only in particular cases that come up. Another thing that strikes me very forcibly is this; having had so much to do with immigrants, that there is something else besides his health in choosing immigrants; his moral character is sometimes more to be considered than that. You have men, and we have men in our institution, brought out by the Canadian government, who never should have been sent to this country.

Q. Assisted passages?—A. Assisted passages. The government's own agents do not know what to do with them. Somebody has been sending men out here who should not have been sent out.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I want the names of those men?—A. I cannot give them to you here. I have them in Toronto, and I will send them to you.

By an Hon. Member:

Q. Do you suggest there should be another kind of examination?—A. Yes. I think I am a judge, after twenty-one years' experience. If I am not, I ought to drop out. There are people who never should have been sent to this country.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Were they under the assisted passage?—A. Yes. I will write a letter to Mr. Forke when I get home and tell him the names of these people, and who sent them to this country.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Are we to understand that the general dissatisfaction in England with the present medical examination is due to a propaganda carried on by the fifteen hundred British doctors who have really been dismissed from their employment?—A. In answering that I would like to say that very likely that is what has happened. It is very likely that there has been propaganda. It is only natural that men losing their jobs would begin to talk. It is bad advertising for Canada, and it does not matter if there has been propaganda. Something is being done to create a feeling in the Old Country against Canada, no doubt about that. I was in Hyde Park one night, where a great crowd was assembled, and two men were standing up there and running down Canada. They said some things that I could not stand any longer, and then I said some things to them. They were men that should never have been allowed to come to Canada. They had been to Canada, and it was pretty hard to deny what they said, because they stuck to it that they knew. The trouble is that these men who come out and are no good go back and say things about Canada that do not do Canada any good. The fellow that makes good does not say anything about Canada; he keeps his mouth shut.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. I hope that you do not pay too much attention to Hyde Park oratory?
—A. Oh, no.

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. You were reading your statement very quickly and I found it difficult to follow it accurately, but I understood you to say that your Association could bring 50,000 British settlers to Canada in a year?—A. I think so.

Q. What would you do with them; how would you place them?—A. The answer to that, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, is this: I said 50,000, and I will read it again, and read it slowly.

I have just been in conference with Lord Lovat, Chairman of the Overseas Settlement Committee of the British Government. I told him about our family reunion work, and this is what he said: "The British Government is prepared to financially assist the British Welcome and Welfare League's family reunion work, if the Canadian or Ontario Governments, either or both, will share the cost on a fifty-fifty basis".

Gentlemen, our League could bring 50,000 women and children to Canada within one year if we had the required financial support.

I said previously that I believe that there were thousands of men—

Q. You meant 50,000 women and children?—A. Families of men who were already here.

Q. Whose male heads were already settled?—A. Yes, and who had homes ready to receive them, and who are working; they do not have to look for work.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You do not mean farmers?—A. No, not necessarily farmers.

Q. You mean mechanics?—A. Anyone.

Q. That is what you must have in mind.—A. The wives and children of any men working anywhere.

Q. People who have not received assisted passage?—A. Quite.

Q. That is to say, people in all walks of life; anyone who has come out here on his own?—A. Yes.

Q. You could get 50,000 women and children to rejoin their families?—

A. We sent a great many people on the farms from our institutions. Allow me to tell you a story that came before me just about a week before I got to the Old Country, which was about three months ago. A man came into my office and stood in front of me and he said, "Mr. Chamberlain, you do not know me?" I said, "No, sir". He said, "My name is Downing". I said, "You know me, Mr. Downing?" He said, "You sent me to a farm seventeen and a half years ago". I said, "Why have you come to see me now, after seventeen years and a half?" He said, "My wife has talked about you and the kindly treatment you gave us hundreds of times on the farm. I went to work on the farm as a farm labourer. I now own the farm, and I do not owe a cent. I have cattle and sheep and pigs, and everything, and I do not owe one cent on that farm." Then he looked up and said, "My wife made me promise to call in and give you \$10 for your kindness to me when I first came to Canada". He is a Canadian farmer now, you see.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. I would like to have this made clear. I understand you to say that there are a number of heads of families now settled in Canada who would like to bring their wives and children to Canada, to the number of some 50,000 and that the 50,000 could be brought to Canada to make the families complete if some assisted passage were given?—A. That is right.

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. Have you, or your organization, made any survey of Canada, as to the number of such heads of families?—A. No, sir. We are only judging from the applications that we have, and from the inquiries that have been made.

Q. I am rather interested in how you arrive at that figure of 50,000?—A. I will admit that that is only a rough estimate. When I went home this time I brought out 212 women and children, who will become the best Canadians possible to get.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. They were wives?—A. Yes, wives and children of men who are working here.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. To what extent would you suggest that assistance be given? If you do render assistance, would you not then be placing many immigrants in the Old Country in the position where they would come and then demand the same from you that you extended to those here?—A. Oh, yes, that is right.

Q. Where are you going to stop—I am a British immigrant too?—A. Let me say that everywhere I have spoken about the reunion of families, everyone seemed to agree that it is a splendid piece of immigration work.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. There is no difficulty about the children now, those under seventeen are paid for now?

MR. FRANK CHAMBERLAIN: (Secretary): Only if going on the land, Mr. Stewart.

THE WITNESS: Only on the land.

HON. MR. FORKE: If your plan were adopted it would pretty nearly mean assisted passage for every family that comes to Canada. No man would come away and bring his family with him, paying full fare, if he knew that he could come out here and then send back for his family, and get them out for almost nothing. It would simply mean assisted passages for everybody. While I was in England I discussed it with Margaret Bondfield. There might be something in the proposition that we do something in the way of assisting families who are in England now, while the husband is here, but if it was to continue it would be an impossible proposition.

THE WITNESS: I do not think it would be wise to make that known publicly all over the world. I discussed that with Miss Bondfield too, Mr. Forke, and I want to say that Miss Bondfield is entirely with us in the reunion of our families. I want to say this too—I am not speaking against Mr. Forke, when I say this, or Mr. Egan—but I think, as the Minister of Immigration and as the Deputy Minister of Immigration, they should long ago have made it their business—they have been to Toronto lots of times on other business that was not half as important—to come into the institution, of which I have the honour to be the President, and make an investigation and see for themselves what was going on. Instead of that, they have never looked inside the door of our institution. I do not think that that is creditable to the Minister and Deputy Minister.

MR. CAHAN: The witness should confine his statement to evidence. He is not here to argue; he is simply here to give facts, and I think we should keep to that.

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. I would like to ask this question, with respect to the institution of which you are the President. I understand that you have some scheme whereby you propose that advances should be made to immigrants to enable them to come to Canada, and a portion of which advance will be paid at a later date by the immigrant who comes out under your auspices. I would like to hear any facts that you can give us with regard to that scheme, and any constructive suggestion that you may make with respect to it?—A. If we could bring out 800 last year, and 1,200 this year, without any assistance from the Government, surely we could bring out a larger number if we had some assistance.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. But you have assistance. Does not the society of Overseas British Women, or the Overseas Settlement Board, assist these people?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. All these people get loans over there.—A. They have no place in Canada, as far as I know.

Q. I am not talking about a place in Canada. The very people you are bringing, the wives and children, are assisted by the Overseas Settlement Board, are they not?—A. A very few of them pay it back to us.

Q. Do they not loan them the passage?—A. Well, in a very few cases they do.

Q. I understand that they do, that that is exactly what the Society of Overseas British Women does. It is affiliated with the Overseas Settlement Board, and assisted by the British Government?—A. They may do that, sir, independent of us, but not through us.

Q. I do not care whether it is through you or not; I say that these people are assisted.—A. There are all kinds of things going on that I do not know of.

Q. Do you say that you do not know?—A. No, I do not know.

Q. That these people are assisted by the British Government?—A. I do not know that they are bringing out families. My secretary says that they are, in some cases.

Q. These people who come out here to settle in Canada—I am not talking about farming—the artisans, mechanics and clerks who come out here to settle; if they afterwards want to bring out their wives and children, the S.O.B.W. and the Overseas Settlement Board do assist them by loaning them their passage?—A. I would answer that by saying that it must be very few, as I do not know anything at all about it.

Q. Everybody else seems to know about it.—A. And the men living here do not know about it.

Q. I am not talking about the men knowing about it.—A. I do not know about it.

Q. Your secretary knows, anyway.—A. He says there are a few cases that they do bring out.

Q. In connection with people who are receiving assisted passage, the agriculturalists, farm labourers and domestics, when they want to join up their families, is it not true that our scheme provides for the assistance of those people?—A. Yes.

Q. In other words, we do give assisted passage?—A. Only to farm labourers.

Q. To the families of the same people we give assisted passage to.—A. To farm labourers, and nothing else.

Q. Agriculturalists, farm labourers and domestics?—A. Yes.

Q. And in addition to that, there are some cases in which the family of the man who has already come here is assisted to come and join him by the Overseas Settlement Board?—A. I am not going to say that there are cases, because

I do not know. I do not know any cases at all where they are bringing families out. They may do that and I not know it.

Q. Do you think these eight hundred people paid their own passage without any assistance?—A. No, they did not; they paid us.

Q. Paid you, then?—A. Yes.

Q. But do you think they are paying their own passage, or paid it, without any assistance?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From the British authorities?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. None of them had assistance from the British authorities?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. Are you in a position to say?

Mr. FRANK CHAMBERLAIN (Secretary): None of them had.

The WITNESS: I do not know of any. For instance, I know a case yesterday where the government—

Q. I am not speaking of an exceptional case. I understood there was a general scheme of assistance for the families of British immigrants who come to Canada but are not assisted by the Canadian government because they do not come under the occupational class, but are assisted by the British Government either directly or indirectly.—A. I do not know anything about that.

Q. You conduct in Toronto the British Welcome and Welfare Hostel?—A. Yes.

Q. That is really yourself?—A. No, sir. It is a public institution, managed by an executive. I am the president. We have a treasurer, we have a secretary, we have a matron, we have a woman under the matron, and we have a caretaker. We have a staff of five.

Q. Will you let me pay you the compliment of suggesting that you are the main spring?—A. I do not know. Some people say because I put my whole heart and soul into the work it is a success. That may be true. I am not ashamed of it.

Q. Is it not a fact that the people you assist are not only the actual newcomers, but British people who have arrived previously, and are "up against it", to use a slang expression?—A. The man who has come here perhaps two months or three months or four months or five months or a year or two years—if he comes out and leaves his family in the Old Country, I say he is living under conditions he should not be asked to live under, and his wife is living under conditions she should not be asked to live under, and everything should be done to get them to this country and make them good Canadians.

Q. You do assist people who have been here two years?—A. Yes.

Q. And is it not a fact that the reason for the support you get from the Ontario Government is because you are providing a hostel?—A. No. In answer to that, we were not carrying on that work at all when the Ontario Government gave us the assistance they did give us. Would you like to know why they gave it?

Q. You were not carrying on what work?—A. The reunion work.

Q. I am talking about this welfare work, the work of helping the fellow who is down and out or up against it.—A. No, sir. It is the giving of a bed to an immigrant for a night or at the most two nights, when they first come to this country. That was the reason.

Q. The reason for what?—A. The reason for the Ontario Government coming in.

Q. At that time were you doing this other work?—A. No.

Q. When did you take that up?—A. Let me be sure about that—

Q. Well, I will put it back farther than 1924. Is it not a fact that you have been carrying on the work for a long time?—A. 21 years.

Q. Among British immigrants—people who have not just arrived the night before, but people who have been here for some time?—A. We give them advice.

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

Q. Not only advice, but helping them in the way of giving them a bed?—
A. No, sir, we do not. We only give them a bed for the first night, or at the most two nights. Not more than two nights.

Q. Anybody at all?—A. Anybody at all.

Q. You mean you would not give a bed to a man who was a British immigrant six months ago who applied to you and said he was up against it?—
A. No, sir. We do not give him a bed because that would at once turn our institution into a lodging house.

Q. What assistance do you give a man who has been here two months or four months or six months or two years?—A. I said in this statement I made that my son and I have counted the number who came, and it averaged fifty a day for all kinds of help. For instance, a man came in the other day and said, "Mr. Chamberlain, I have been in the country only three months and a man has done me out of \$600. I have given it to two lawyers, but they do not seem able to get my money." I took the trouble to put on my coat and go down and see the man and inside of two days I got \$450. That was helping a Britisher, was it not? He went back to the Old Country when he got his \$450.

Q. What help do you give a man who has been here for two years?—
A. We have done our share.

Q. I thought you said you did not help a man who had been here two years.—A. I said that for the first five or six years of our institution we placed over 10,000 into work, but we do not do it now because the work is not there for placing them. We used to have employers calling us up all day long for employees, but they do not do that any more.

Q. Have you a register showing the people you have helped in the last two years?—A. No, only the people who come in the first night.

Q. Who come in for the first night and for meals?—A. Yes, they show their landing card—

Q. You would have a register of those?—A. Yes.

Q. Which would show when they landed?—A. Yes.

Q. And in no case have you given a bed and meals to a man who has not just come in?—A. Oh, there may be some come in and give exceptional reason why I should give them beds, but as a rule we do not do that. If a man comes in and I think he is a real worthy fellow, and can give a good account of himself, I give him a bed.

Q. As I understand it the Federal authorities, under the agreement of 1924, pay you for that bed and meals?—A. They only pay for their deportation cases and for any particular cases that are sent up, where a man is destitute, but they do not pay for the general immigrant coming in. Do not misunderstand that. When an immigrant comes in they do not pay us anything for him. We spend in carrying on the work of our institution every year—I have to raise \$12,000 a year to carry on the running expenses.

Q. You spoke of a contribution by the Federal Government, and we want to get that clear. As I understand they pay you for all people they send to you.—A. Who have no money, or who are to be deported.

Q. For the people they send to you?—A. No, they do not.

Q. I have a letter in my hand showing your arrangement with the Government. Perhaps you have a copy of it?—A. Yes, we have it on file.

Q. Let me see if this is correct. It is a letter dated the 10th March, 1924, and reads as follows:

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

Copy.

THE BRITISH WELCOME AND WELFARE LEAGUE
 TORONTO, Canada,
 March 10, 1924.

Personal.

W. J. EGAN, Esq.,
 Deputy Minister of Immigration,
 Ottawa, Ontario.

DEAR MR. EGAN:—Re Hostel for British Immigrants.

Our Executive, meeting last Thursday, decided to go forward with our plans to open a Hostel in the near future where British immigrants will be welcomed and cared for overnight upon their immediate arrival in Canada.

Following our conversation of the third instant... Would the Dominion Government supply our Institution with the cost of providing food and beds for immigrants from the British Isles who are entertained at our Institution.

We would of course present to the Government the names of all immigrants and where they are from and the detailed cost of entertaining them overnight. This could be done as often as you so desire.

In pre-war days an average of 5,000 immigrants passed through our institution yearly. This year possibly that number would be increased, as your Government is planning an aggressive campaign for newcomers.

The cost to our League for supplying beds would be .25c per person. We could supply meals at a cost to us of .35c for adults and .25c for children. This would average a cost of .55c for every immigrant who came to us. You will agree that this is an exceptionally low cost.

May we hear from you just as soon as it is possible to arrange this matter. We have splendid prospects of securing our proposed Hostel and the sooner we can make this arrangement with the Government the sooner your department can send newcomers to us to be cared for overnight before going on to their destination.

We understand that 10,000 immigrants are expected in Canada this month, the majority of whom are British. We would like to be ready to care for those Britishers who come to Toronto.

Yours cordially,

(Sgd). A. CHAMBERLAIN,
 President.

Then there is this letter:

777986.

27th March, 1924.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN,—With reference to your letter of March 10th, in connection with caring for British immigrants overnight immediately after their arrival in Canada, I beg to advise you that it has been decided to agree to the arrangement as outlined in your letter, that is to say, the Department is prepared to pay the British Welcome and Welfare League for British immigrants temporarily given accommodation by such organization at the following rates:—

	Cents
Cost per bed per person	25
Cost per meal for adults	35
Cost per meal for child	25

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

the Department to be only responsible for any expense in connection with arriving immigrants whose cases Mr. J. C. Mitchell, our Agent at Toronto, approves of, that is to say, before any expense in connection with accommodation is incurred by this Department, the approval of our Agent at Toronto must be obtained; secondly, accounts in duplicate to be furnished monthly, giving the following particulars:—

Name of each person accommodated,
Number of meals and lodgings,
Amount charged,

Such accounts to be submitted to the Immigration Agent at Toronto for certification and forwarding to the Department for payment.

I shall be glad to know whether your League is prepared to handle the matter in accordance with the above outlined arrangement; immediately on receipt of an affirmative reply, the necessary instructions will be issued to our Agent at Toronto.

Yours very truly,

Deputy Minister.

A. Chamberlain, Esq.,
The British Welcome and Welfare League,
Toronto, Ont.

Does that correctly set out the arrangement?—A. Which does not amount to anything.

Q. What do you mean by that?—A. If we had to depend on what we get, it would not pay for the salt they use.

Q. And this is your letter in reply:

THE BRITISH WELCOME AND WELFARE LEAGUE

TORONTO, CANADA, March 29, 1924.

W. J. EGAN, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Immigration,
Ottawa, Ont.

DEAR MR. EGAN,—We wish to thank you sincerely for your letter of the 27th instant.

We are delighted with the proposal outlined in your letter and will accept it at once.

We will now go ahead with our plans, and I will write you more fully at the beginning of next week.

Your cordially,

(Sgd.) A. CHAMBERLAIN.

That is correct?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, further than that I understand there has been some suggestion that you should charge more than the amount set out for meals. Is that correct?—A. Yes, but not the first night. The second night we charge more, for this reason: we charge fifty cents for the second night. If we did not, they would want to stay there altogether.

Q. I am speaking about the arrangement with the government. Has it not been suggested by Mr. Egan or some official of the Department that you should charge them more than this amount, and the Government would pay it?—A. Yes. Mr. Egan took the position that any immigrant coming to this country ought to be ready to go to any hotel and pay his own way.

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

Q. That is not my question. Did not some official of the Department suggest that you should charge more—A. To the man, not to the Government. I never understood it that way.

Q. That was when you were asking for a special grant?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Egan was suggesting you should charge more for the service you rendered, so you would not be placed in the invidious position of a private institution receiving a grant from the Government when the others did not?—A. No, sir. Let me say this: that Mr. Mitchell is one of the finest officers in the employ of the Government to-day, but his office closes at five o'clock and we have hundreds of immigrants coming into our institution after five o'clock. Mr. Mitchell only sends me a note just in a very particular case where a man will be deported, or where he is stranded in the city, and he sends along a note, "Dear Mr. Chamberlain: Will you take charge of this man for the night or two days or three days?" We do that. That does not amount to anything. That is not 1 per cent of the immigrants we take charge of. What would that amount to, to help us in our work?

Q. You are giving evidence and we must try to be as accurate as possible. How many do you keep a night?—A. We can sleep eighty a night. I was looking up the records yesterday to see how many had slept there during the last four weeks, and between 400 and 500 had slept in our institution during the last four weeks.

Q. You said hundreds had applied to you after five o'clock?—A. During the year there would be hundreds. Some of them come in at four o'clock in the morning.

Q. And does Mr. Mitchell ever permit you to charge for the people for whom he has not sent a note?—A. I do not know that he does.

Q. The way you put it, it sounded to me as if Mr. Mitchell's office closed at five o'clock, and these men came in at six or seven o'clock, and would have no note from Mr. Mitchell, but you would take them but could not charge anything to the Government?—A. We never thought of charging the Government for the general immigrants who come and say, "Well, I am Mr. Mitchell's man, from up in the country, and I am to see Mr. Mitchell in the morning, but his office is closed." I take them in for the night and get in touch with Mr. Mitchell in the morning, and he gives me a note. Mr. Mitchell is a very, very fair man.

Q. And he has often been at your institution?—A. Oh yes.

Q. He is the representative of the Department there?—A. Yes. I want to say that if he were here I would like you to put him in the position I am in to-day and you would find he could tell you some wonderful stories which would be useful for the Government to know.

Q. Mr. Blair has been there from the head office?—A. Yes, once or twice.

Q. Do you know his position?—A. Yes.

Q. What is it?—A. Assistant Deputy Minister.

Q. There is another class provided for by the Department, and that is the wife and children coming to join the head of a family in Canada, families stranded or even those who are not here in connection with the assisted passage. These people are assisted by the Government? You are paid for their lodging?—A. Any case Mr. Mitchell sends. We do not care whether they have a dozen children.

Q. Mr. Mitchell is not niggardly in the way of granting assistance?—A. He only sends us one or two cases a week. They do not amount to that much (indicating by a snap of the fingers).

Q. But Mr. Mitchell is not niggardly? He is not mean about it?—A. Excuse me. You are trying to make a great big thing of what Mr. Mitchell does, but we say that Mr. Mitchell does not pretend to do a big thing with us; he just sends us an odd man whom he does not know what to do with. Our society does not

care that much (indicating by a snap of the fingers) whether the Government sends them to us or not. We do not want them.

Q. The tone of your letter of March 29 sounds as if you were pleased about it.—A. How much have we received since that letter was written?

Q. I do not know.—A. You can find out.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, are we interested in these matters such as Mr. Mitchell giving an order for twenty-five cents for a meal, and so on?

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I thought Mr. Chamberlain was advocating some other scheme of assistance to his particular institution, and I was trying to find out for the benefit of the Committee, just what is done. I did not think it was brought out very clearly, just what was done by the Department, or Mr. Chamberlain's Society at the time it was done. I think I have brought that out. Now, I should like one or two words with regard to the medical examination overseas. Mr. Cahan, I think, has put the thing succinctly that it is these fifteen hundred doctors that Mr. Chamberlain considers the cause of the trouble.

WITNESS: No, I did not say that.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Do I understand you to say there is more expense now than there was?—A. Yes.

Q. What is it?—A. They did not have to get photographs under the old conditions. Now, a man has to go and pay five shillings for a photograph, and by the time he has paid for his family, he has paid perhaps fifteen shillings.

Q. Since how long has the photograph been required?—A. I do not know that. It was going on when I was there, and there were complaints to me about it.

Q. But you do not know how long ago it was first required?—A. No.

Q. You mentioned travelling expenses too?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know how many doctors are engaged, including the roster doctors, and the doctors of the staff?—A. I understood, including the roster doctors, and the Canadian doctors, there are sixty-five, and that includes Mr. Egan's own son.

Q. Is he a qualified doctor?—A. I do not know anything about that. I met him.

Q. Is he required?—A. I do not know.

Q. That does not interest you?—A. No.

Q. Why did you mention him?—A. To let you know that he was there.

Q. Is there any doubt about it whatever. Can you tell me how many people are assisted by your welfare work in the course of a year?—A. I could not answer that.

Q. Can you give me an idea whether it is five hundred or one thousand?—A. You mean, that is, that I help in giving aid and everything?

Q. These people that you help in all the different activities you have?—A. I should think they average fifty a day. That would be 10,000 a year.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Is there any complaint in the Old Country that the examination made by the Canadian doctors in the Old Country is more severe than that by the old roster doctors? Are they turning down more?—A. Are they turning down more people?

Q. Is there any complaint that the medical examination by the Canadian doctors at the present time is more severe than it used to be under the old system?—A. I did not hear any complaints along that line, but I heard com-

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

plaints about the way they are examined; they have to go up and wait their turn. Under the old system, it was a man who lived in the town, and they could go up in the evening, without losing any time at all. Then I heard complaints in one county where two doctors were at the side of the county. A man had to travel a long way across to get to the doctor. Then, I went to one place, in fact, my own native town, and I asked the ticket agent there what he thought of the new regulation and he said, "I have never seen a doctor here yet, so I do not know anything about it."

Q. Where was that?—A. In Glastonburg.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Will you repeat that statement, I did not hear you?—A. I said that I went to one town where a doctor had never been, and I called Doctor Jeffs' attention to that, and he said a doctor was going there once a week.

The CHAIRMAN: May I point out to the Committee that it is now twenty minutes past twelve, and we have another witness yet to be heard.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to a suggestion that was made, that Mr. Chamberlain should charge more for meals and that the Department would be willing to assist in the payment. Mr. Chamberlain spoke of an interview, and I should like to make clear what was said. I remember that discussion very well, and I wish to ask a question or two about it.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. It was being pointed out to you, Mr. Chamberlain, that your association was entirely a voluntary association; you were asking for a grant from the Department of Immigration?—A. I certainly was.

Q. I think I pointed out to you at the time that you were placing your Association in a rather peculiar position, because there were a great many other organizations that had exactly the same right to ask for public assistance; for instance, the Salvation Army, the Women's Hostel, and numerous others; the Catholic Women's League, and other organizations; and I suggested to you at the time, or it was suggested in my hearing, that if you would charge more for the immigrants that were sent to you by the Immigration Department, the Department would be willing to pay the amount of the additional charge. Now, I know your overhead. You will see, of course, that that was a small percentage, but that small percentage is the percentage that the Immigration Department was responsible for coming to Toronto, and consequently we were quite willing to pay your organization the reasonable charges over and above what was agreed to in your letter to the Deputy Minister. I remember that distinctly, and I might point out to you also that we made you a grant of \$1,000 which no other association is getting, and so you are one thousand dollars ahead of all the other associations. You do not seem to be very grateful for the assistance you got?—A. Not at all, sir. Let me say, that money does not affect me that much (snapping his fingers), and personally, I do not care if the Government gave a cent. In fact, Mr. Egan said that we were not to get any more money.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Can you produce that letter?—A. Yes, I have it on file. I read what the letter said, that we need not expect to get any more.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: When I made that grant to you, I did not attach any string to it.

WITNESS: Well, I will tell you, sir, for a great many years, most of the time that I have been connected with this work—I have been giving my life

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

without salary to this work—and I want to say this, that I have been offered big salaries to go out into other work, and I want to say that I am not talking politics now, because I am not in politics, but there are some things in life, gentlemen, that are bigger even than politics, and the reception of immigrants is one of them. I want to say that I felt very sore when the Government, or when Mr. Forke, as the Minister of Immigration gave us \$1,000 for two years. I said to myself, Mr. Forke does not know this institution, Mr. Forke does not know what we are doing. Then I summed it up in just one word: "He is a Scotchman."

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to a question I asked some time ago. Before it could be answered, an interruption occurred. I understand the witness to say that his Association makes advances to those who are resident and domiciled in Canada for the purpose of enabling them to bring the women and children of their families to Canada. I would like to know the sources from which the society receives the funds which it advances, and the conditions under which those advances are made with respect to the repayment thereof?—A. Now, Mr. Cahan, just in short, you want to know where the money comes from?

Q. I want to know where the money comes from; under what conditions you make the advances, and as to the terms of repayment to you of the advances so made?—A. Well, it does not come from the Government, to begin with. Let me say first of all, the man has to have half of the cost of bringing his family out. Then, we bring them out, and they start to pay in \$5 a week to pay back what they have borrowed, the other half, without any interest. I say, they ought to pay it back; why should they not pay it back?

Q. I am not objecting; I am asking for facts, and not for argument?—A. Well, now, Mr. Cahan wants to know where the money comes from to pay the loans, is that it?

Q. No, is the Society a charitable institution?—A. No.

Q. Or is it an institution to which the public subscribe funds?—A. Yes.

Q. I want to know in a general way how they are paid?—A. Now, sir, I will answer that. When I opened my mail, in one week, at Christmas' time, I received \$2,200 through the mail. Did Mr. Egan hear that? Mr. Egan is talking, and I want him to hear that.

Q. Never mind what Mr. Egan is doing. I have asked you a question, and we are not here for a joke, or for recrimination, and we are giving much time to these proceedings. Give me the facts?—A. I think I have the right to ask Mr. Egan to listen to that answer. During Christmas week I received \$2,200 in my letters, towards the general work of our institution, from newspaper editors, from merchants, and especially from men whom we had helped. Then, we have subscriptions coming in all the time. For instance, when I was going over on the boat, a lady was talking to me about immigration, and I told her about these stories of re-uniting families. To my very great surprise, yesterday I got a cheque from South Africa for \$100 from that lady. I get money in all kinds of ways to help carry on that work. For instance, I went to the "Telegram;" you all know the "Toronto Evening Telegram." I said, "what about you giving me \$100 towards carrying on our work towards the immigrants?" The answer was, "We will give you \$200, because you are doing one of the best works in the country." That is where we get the money from.

Q. Then I understand from the witness that the funds come very largely from public subscribers?—A. Yes, very largely.

Q. To what amount are these contributions made annually? What is the annual revenue of the Association, approximately?—A. Last year our work

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

jumped up from, in previous years \$5,000 to \$10,000—it jumped up last year to \$60,000. And, our books were sent out to chartered accountants, and examined, and the reports sent to the Government.

Q. I am not making any reflections on your management. I have no doubt you spend every dollar economically. Now, how many advances did you make to individuals resident in Canada to enable them to bring out their families during the past year?—A. I cannot give you the total, Mr. Cahan.

Q. Approximately?—A. For the bringing out of 800 women and children.

Q. That is certainly a very commendable work; very commendable indeed. Now, what would be the average advance which your Society would make? I understand you to say that the applicant contributes half, and your Society contributes half in this work, which commends itself to me. Now, what would be the average advance that you would make to each of these families?—A. I should think they would average as near as I can judge, right off, about \$150 for each family.

Q. Was that \$150, in addition to the \$150, made by the applicant? If so, that would amount to about \$300 per family for bringing out the members of their family?—A. Yes, that is about right, as near as I can tell you off-hand.

Q. And with respect to these families whom you have brought out, how many families would be represented in the eight hundred people you brought out last year?—A. Well, of course, that is a difficult question to answer.

Q. I know, but I am asking for round numbers. Would it represent 300 or 400 families?—A. About 250, I should think.

Q. Now, in respect to these families, whom you have assisted to come to Canada, have you subsequently found any difficulties arising with regard to their settlement, and their average of prosperity in Canada after they came?—A. We have found very little difficulty. We might have an odd case or two, where they do not fit in exactly, but we tell these people we bring out, that under no circumstances are they to become chargeable to any institution, but to come directly to us, and we will tide them over their difficulties. I could give you cases where we have sent groceries and coal, and helped them, and these men then after they got work paid us back again for what we had spent.

Q. Then you find that the settlement is, then, on the whole, satisfactory?—A. Oh, very.

Q. And that these persons who come out after overcoming their initial difficulties, are able to take care of their families?—A. Certainly, sir.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Where are these families situated?—A. At Peterborough, Oshawa, Hamilton, Brantford, Windsor, Stratford and a great number in Toronto.

Q. That is, they are in the province of Ontario?—A. Largely. We have a few cases West. And let me say that the British Government is very anxious to know if this work could be extended outside the province of Ontario.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. You spoke of a meeting in London, which you addressed, and at which a good many people were present; who were those people representing?—A. Those people were representing the Emigration Societies of the country, such as Colonel Lamb, of the Salvation Army, and Miss Johnstone, of the United Church.

Q. Were all these people objecting to the medical examination?—A. Everyone but Miss Johnstone, who said she would rather wait a little longer and see how it would work out.

Q. Did they make any mention with regard to a mental examination apart from the physical examination, or a moral examination apart from the physical examination about which you spoke?—A. Yes.

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

Q. Did they complain bitterly about it?—A. They complained about it.

Q. Were not most of the examinations complained about, of people you would not admit into the country under the Roster Doctors?—A. Yes, and those men may have been called to account for it, and should have been called to account for it.

Q. Was any objection taken to the moral examination, under the present system?—A. I did not hear of that.

Q. Were they not all agreed that the system was too new for them to come to any definite conclusion?—A. No; the only two persons in England I heard say that were Miss Johnstone, of the United Church, and the Hon. Mr. Greenfield, of Alberta, who said "I have nothing to say against it, I have nothing to say in its favour, I would rather wait and see how it turns out".

Q. Have you found any Press opinion in the Old Country against immigration?—A. Not whilst I was there. There had been, I understand, a great deal said.

Q. Did you know of it?—A. Yes, I knew of it, but it was not done while I was there.

Q. It was not done while you were there, at any rate?—A. No.

Q. Has that Press opinion gained impetus through the medical examinations now in force?—A. I do not understand you.

Q. Has that opinion against immigration to Canada gained impetus through the medical examination now in force?—A. I could not say.

Q. Have you seen any press opinions about the examination?—A. I gave the Premier the same opinion; I have given the same opinion here, and it is my honest opinion.

Q. We do not doubt your bona fides?—A. If I had heard people speak in favour of it, I would have said so just the same.

Q. You understand that you are making a strong statement here, which will be broadcast, and I wanted to see whether you were really of that impression.—A. I am not under that impression.

Q. Do you say that there is no discrimination against British emigrants coming to this country?—A. I said it in the Old Country, and I say it now that any Britisher is welcome at any time to come to Canada and make good in this wonderful country of ours.

Q. Apart from the photograph and the trifling examination expenses, have you any objection to a strict examination in the Old Country?—A. I have no objection.

Q. Do you not think it is a very proper thing to do?—A. It may be all right I have heard this said in the Old Country, that the Canadian Government had a perfect right to send their doctors over to the Old Country; on the other hand, I have heard others speak the other way. There is a great deal to be said about doctors in the Old Country having the reputation of doing the right thing.

Q. I will admit all that. We are not bothering about that, in Canada. Do you not think that it is better to have this strict examination of emigrants on the other side rather than have it here, and then have them deported; do you not think it would be better to have it there than here?—A. I think so. I think honestly a man is better off if he looks at it in that light, to be examined there, before he leaves, than in Quebec.

Q. And be deported again?—A. I think the Old Country doctors even in that case would be just as good as young doctors who might be sent over there to do it.

Q. Do you not think there would be very much more care taken by Canadian doctors appointed through the Canadian Government, to see that emigrants are properly inspected rather than by those who have no interest in this country?—A. No, I do not think that. I think very highly of the doctors in both countries.

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

Q. At all events, you are satisfied that the examination should take place in the Old Country rather than here?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. And it is only a question of working out the details, to make it satisfactory?

By Mr. Millar:

Q. You spoke of a plan of bringing out women and children to join their husbands and fathers in Canada, under a plan you have organized yourselves; and you said that when they had paid one half of their passages, you would be able to bring out 800. Do you think if all their passages were paid you would be able to bring out 50,000 instead of 800 in one year?—A. What do you mean by saying all their passages?

Q. You suggested that if the government gave sufficient financial assistance, your own organization would bring out 50,000 a year, of these women and children?—A. Not all the passage, but if the government should stand behind us to the extent of one half their passage we would bring out 50,000.

Q. One half is paid now?—A. I mean the other half.

Q. You mean that if the other half were paid you would bring out 50,000?—A. Yes.

Q. There is a big jump from 800 to 50,000?—A. We have no backing to do it with.

Q. Are you sure you could place 50,000 if you could get them out here?—A. They are already placed; the men are here, working in this country. We will not bring out a family unless we get word from the employers that the men are working here and are getting wages.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. You said that as a kind of guess?—A. I said it as a kind of guess, but I do know this, that we could bring a tremendous number of people from the Old Country if we had the financial help we want to do it with. Personally I do not care if we never bring them out. I am not in this thing for anything I can make out of it. What I do say is this, that here is a chance of bringing out the very best class of women, and especially children, who will in a very few years become the right kind of Canadians.

Q. Would you or your Secretary later on supply to the Committee the number of applications you have received within the last year for assisted passages; can you do that?—A. I doubt that. If a lot of men come in, and we say we cannot help them, or if one man comes in and I come to the conclusion that he is not a man worthy to be helped, I say "No, we cannot help you". He will walk away, without any application. However, I think the Secretary could give you that information, or pretty nearly anyway.

Q. Will you ask the Secretary to supply to the Committee the number of applications you received last year?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. You loan through your agency 50 per cent of the applicant's passage; you require him to put up 50 per cent, and you lend him the other 50 per cent. In order to help the Committee in discussing this question, your opinion is that the emigrant should always put up one half?—A. Yes.

Q. Or you will not assist him?—A. No.

Q. He repays it at \$5 a month?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you had many losses; do they run into any considerable sum?—A. Of course we cannot estimate our losses yet. Supposing we were behind last year—I cannot tell you right off how much we were behind in the payments, so it is hard to estimate the exact losses, or to even take a guess. They are still paying.

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

Q. But you have an idea, what would be approximately your losses?—A. I think 80 per cent had been paid back last year.

Q. Eighty per cent?—A. Yes. On the other 20 per cent, as I say, it would be pretty hard to tell how much would be the natural loss.

Q. You would have some loss?—A. We will, and it must be covered in some way. If it is not covered by the government, we will get it covered some other way.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. You spoke strongly about receiving no calls from the Minister and Deputy Minister?—A. Yes. I felt it very strongly.

Q. That is a personal point of view?—A. No, it is national.

Q. Is it not a fact that the Assistant Deputy Minister of Immigration did call at your office, and did see you?—A. Yes.

Q. Also that there is an Immigration Officer in Toronto who waited upon you?—A. Yes.

Q. Is it your suggestion that the whole general staff should visit your office periodically?—A. No. I do not care whether Mr. Egan or Mr. Forke never come.

Q. You thought the Immigration Department organization was not very good?—A. No, sir.

Q. You said in your letter that the offer made by the Department was quite satisfactory, that you were delighted with it?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you changed your opinion about that?—A. Yes, I certainly have.

Q. You were of the opinion, then, that the offer made by the Department was entirely satisfactory to you?—A. I thought it was going to work out well.

Q. You were delighted?—A. I was delighted to think that they were willing to do anything.

Q. You did not say so?—A. I say so now.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. Do you consider it the duty of the Minister or the Deputy Minister to visit your office?—A. Yes.

Q. To visit every voluntary association in Canada, but yours in particular?—A. Let me say in answer to that, that when I went to the Hon. John Martin and asked him to come to our institution and see for himself what was being done, he answered at once, "I will be down to your institution at half past nine o'clock to-morrow morning." He said to me when he got there, "I am Minister of Immigration for Ontario. What would you do, supposing you were Minister of Immigration?" I answered him by saying, "I would find out first of all what the officials were doing for the money they were getting, and the second thing I would do, I would find out if the Immigration Officers were doing their duty, and if not I would put them out of business, and if they were doing their duty I would stand behind them."

Q. Then Mr. Martin did come around and put some institutions out of business?—A. I said, "The next thing I would do, Mr. Martin, would be to examine all the books of institutions to which money would be subscribed." He turned around and said, "Does that include your own organization?" I said I would be very glad. He came to me next day and spent an hour and a half examining my books, and then purchased a hostel in Toronto.

Q. He is the Minister of Immigration for the Province of Ontario?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I have not been in Toronto very often. I appreciate your invitation. The last time I was in Toronto I had not time to spare, but I asked my Secretary if he could go and visit your establishment, and give me a report.

[Mr. Albert Chamberlain.]

I got that report, and that is all I could do under the circumstances. You have had the Assistant Deputy, and you have had my Secretary?—A. In answer to that, I would say that I had Mr. Little, and I had Mr. Joliffe, and I had your Secretary, and they were delightful men and went away and I believe gave us a good report. Then, because they gave good reports, you cut down what we wanted from \$2,500 to \$1,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Might I ask if we are going to hear another witness to-day?

Mr. EGAN: May I be permitted to say a word?

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Egan would like to make a statement with regard to going to Toronto.

Mr. EGAN: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: It is true that Mr. Chamberlain invited me to visit his particular institution, and it is true that many of our officers have been there. I accepted that invitation and I still have it in mind to accept it, but unfortunately, I have only been in Toronto once since that invitation was extended to me, and that was between five and seven o'clock in the morning, catching a train going further west. That perhaps, will help to explain the situation.

Mr. CAHAN: No explanation is necessary.

Mr. EGAN: I feel there is one more point that should be cleared up. There is a suggestion that in the sixty-five Canadian doctors there is Mr. Egan's son. I do not think I should let that go without saying that my son, after his matriculation examination at the age of eighteen years in Cape Town, South Africa, and before he knew the result of his matriculation examination, left for England and became a member of the Royal Field Artillery. He served as a special reserve officer, getting promotions from time to time, and was badly hurt eleven days before the end of the war. He went back to his battery and served as a reserve officer for nine months after the end of the war. He went to visit his mother in Cape Town, and then went back to England. Having matriculated previous to his service in 1916, he became a doctor through Kings University in London, a Charing Cross man. Since his passing as a doctor he has secured several degrees, and had two years' post graduate work, and for the past year was chief resident medical officer of London Locke Hospital, in London, in charge of ninety-five beds. He made his own application, as a Canadian doctor, without my knowledge in any shape or form, and if ever I have spoken to him about it it has been since he made the application, because I thought he might have gone on with some special work he was on. Why my son should be mentioned is beyond me; it is small.

The WITNESS: I am sorry that I mentioned that. It is a fact that he is there, but I want to say this for Mr. Egan's son. He appeared to me to be a very, very delightful man, and well able to carry on the duties that were entrusted to him. I just made that statement, but it is a fact, just the same. I am sorry if Mr. Egan feels offended about that, at the same time it is a fact and it will have to go at that.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. What about the Scotchman?—A. I will not apologize for that, because I do not think you will ever change your colours.

Witness retired.

Committee adjourned until 4 p.m., May 2, 1928.

The Committee resumed at 4 o'clock, p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, to-morrow we will have Mr. C. A. Magrath of Toronto, and Colonel Dennis of the C.P.R.; on Friday, we will have Mr. Barton of Macdonald College; and on Tuesday, the Hon. George Langley; H. E. Spencer, M.P. for the U.F.S., and A. E. Darby for the U.F. of Manitoba.

This afternoon we have Mr. Farthing representing the Canadian Legion.

Mr. CAMPBELL: May I ask if Mr. Farthing represents the Dominion Command or a Western part of it?

The CHAIRMAN: We will ascertain that from Mr. Farthing. I might have said to those who are interested in the wheat grading question that on Monday, Mr. E. C. Ramsay, General Manager of the Pool, Winnipeg, will be here.

Mr. HUGH FARTHING called and sworn.

By the Chairman:

Q. Will you state to the Committee whom you represent, Mr. Farthing, and then continue with what you have to say?—A. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am here representing the Dominion Command of the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League. I myself, come from the West, but possibly since our Branch is in the West, they have been more keenly and directly interested in this question than the Eastern branches. The Dominion Command decided that a Western man should represent it, and the choice fell upon me, not by my own wish, gentlemen, I assure you.

At a previous session of the Committee, the question was asked as to what is the British Empire Service League. It is an association of soldiers, veterans who fought with the British armies during the great war. It was founded by the late Field Marshal Earl Haig who was its first president. As you will doubtless remember, Lord Haig visited Canada in the Summer of 1925, for the purpose of forming a branch of the British Empire Service League in this country. By a union of several pre-existing soldier organizations, the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League was formed. Our President of the Canadian Legion is General Sir Percy Lake. The first Vice-president is Lt.-Col. L. R. Lafleche of Ottawa; and the second Vice-president is Lt.-Col. J. McAra. General McCuaig, is, I believe, the president of the Quebec Provincial Command. We have upwards of 45,000 paid-up memberships at the present time. There are 673 active local branches in Canada, of which 60 are in Alberta, and 115 in Saskatchewan, and a considerable number in Manitoba.

The interest of the Legion in immigration and colonization is not a new thing, and in this connection I might draw attention to the report of the Legion's committee on Empire relations of January 20th, 1927, at the convention held in Winnipeg. The first clause of the special committee's recommendations on matters dealing with Empire relations, deals with immigration, and land settlement within the Empire. The following is an extract from a resolution on this subject.—(Reading):

Whereas by the Empire Settlement Act passed in 1922, the Imperial Government provided an Annual appropriation of £3,000,000 for a period of fifteen years, or a total approximately of over \$200,000,000, for the purpose of assisting in the migration and settlement of people from the British Isles in the various Dominions.

And whereas because the Dominion generally have not provided schemes covering the settlement of any large number of people, only a small portion of the said annual appropriation of £3,000,000 has ever been used in any year.

(Mr. Hugh Farthing.)

And whereas from 60 to 70 per cent of the people available for migration from the British Isles to the Dominions are returned soldiers.

And whereas the British Empire Service League is vitally interested in inter-Empire migration and has solicited the co-operation of the Canadian Legion, of the B.E.S.L. in forwarding the work of inter-Empire migration.

And whereas the Canadian Legion of the B.E.S.L. is vitally interested in the development of the unsettled lands in Canada through people who were comrades in the Great War,

Be it resolved that,

1. The Canadian Legion heartily endorse the general principle of Empire Settlement.

2. The Canadian Legion urge upon the Canadian Government that every endeavour should be made to negotiate with the British Government under the Empire Settlement Act, such agreements as will bring to Canada as large a volume of British settlers, and as large an amount of British capital for development purposes, as is possible.

In addition to that I may say that we have ever present with us the question of rehabilitation of the returned soldier, especially the man who is more or less disabled; the question of the employment of the returned soldier is constantly before us in all our branches under the Dominion Command; and as you are doubtless well aware, we maintain in Ottawa a Service Bureau, of which my friend Mr. Herwig—who sits at my left—is the Secretary, and by means of which Bureau the Legion endeavours to co-operate with the Government in every way in connection with soldiers' problems.

To take a general point of view, I think it will be readily admitted that the men who fought for the country in the war, and were ready to sacrifice everything, and who may, in a sense, be said to represent those who did not return, I think certainly have a right to be heard on this all-important question of immigration, which is a matter which affects us for all time. Any other political question which may be decided wrongly can be rectified in the next generation, or in the next hundred years, at any rate; but this question of immigration is one which those of this generation are deciding for the whole future of the country, and therefore the request was made by the Dominion Command that we should be represented before your Committee. The request was very readily acceded to, and I wish on behalf of the Canadian Legion to thank you very much for this opportunity of presenting our views to the Committee. I trust that our representations will commend themselves to you as being very moderate, and I wish at the outset to guard, if I may, against the possibility of a misinterpretation, which I notice on reading Hansard a few weeks ago, was placed upon some remarks which an hon. member made in the House. When I use the words "English-speaking" or "British races", or any similar terms, I wish to preface any such allusions by saying that so far as our Legion is concerned, we recognize quite frankly the fact that this is a dual-language country. We are quite ready, most enthusiastically, to welcome on the same basis as we do the English-speaking people, those who speak the French language as their mother-tongue. The all-important question from our point of view is the question of assimilation, and those who speak French or are of French blood, can assimilate people of a similar race from Europe just as well as the English-speaking can assimilate the British. The only reason, of course, that there has been comparatively little French-speaking immigration from Europe, is that France has not now a surplus population, and possibly if I, in the course of my representations, should stress the English-speaking people and the British races, I want to qualify my remarks now, once and for all, by saying that we, as a Legion, include in all our requests for quotas, and so on, the French-speaking people along with the British.

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

I may say, also, sir, that I wish to preface my representations—I hardly think it is necessary—with the remark that we are not here to attack any one or to make any charges against any one or any organization. We quite frankly admit that the trend of immigration in the past two years has caused our members a certain amount of disturbance of mind, and the views which we express may perhaps not commend themselves to all the members of this Committee, but we are certainly not here for the purpose of presenting any carping criticism of the Government, or the Department of Immigration, or of any official thereof. We merely wish to help the Committee, and to say that we appreciate the invitation given to set forth our views, for whatever they may be worth.

As far as the general question of immigration in this country is concerned, as a whole, whether large numbers of people should be encouraged, or whether they should not, I do not propose on behalf of the Legion, at this time to venture any suggestion. I think possibly that is outside the main purpose of our argument. We have not had our Dominion Convention this year as yet. Conventions have been held in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and a report to which I shall presently refer has been prepared, after a year's survey by a Committee of our Legion in Saskatchewan. In order that we may not presume at this time at any rate to make our recommendations too numerous, so to speak, or to attempt to make recommendations which lie possibly beyond our province, I express at this time no opinion as to whether general immigration should be encouraged or whether it should not. As a legion, however, we are strongly in favour of just as numerous an immigration and just as large an immigration as may be considered necessary for the proper settlement of this country. If it is desirable at this time that large numbers of people should be encouraged to come here, subject to the qualifications as to selection to which I shall presently refer. We are strongly in favour of such immigration. Our Saskatchewan report, which is generally accepted, shows that both in Canada and the United States the tendency has been that farms increase in size. The number of farms in Saskatchewan has decreased of recent years, although the production has greatly increased. That is the tendency which has been marked also in the State of Kansas and in other parts of the United States. So that with homesteads being entered upon more and more it is just a question whether there is any great need of hurry in agricultural immigration to-day. However, that is by the way. To put it quite frankly, sir, our main representation—and it is really the basis of our whole case and the one great point which we desire to impress upon you with the greatest respect and as strongly as we can—is that we feel that for the past two years at any rate the proportion of continental immigration as compared with English and French-speaking immigration to this country has been too great. I do not think it is necessary to give you the figures, with which you are more familiar than I am, but the figures for the fiscal year ending the 31st of March 1927 and for the fiscal year just closed show that British immigration has been in a distinct minority.

I propose first of all to deal with the question with regard to the economic point of view,—how it affects the labour market, because we are so greatly concerned with employment for our returned soldiers in this country; and subsequently with what is really of more importance, that is, the permanent effect upon the country, from the point of view of the building up of the nationality of the Canadian people that is to be.

We understand that the policy for years, the accepted policy of Canada in regard to immigration, has been defined in a report issued by the Canadian Legion, Saskatchewan Command, Committee on Immigration:

“Urban population”—to quote from a brochure recently issued by the Department of Immigration (Canada and Immigration, Ottawa, 1927)—“which already exceeds 50 per of the whole, is equal to the

country's present requirements, and the continual drift from country to city, which is a feature of modern life is likely to at least maintain that proportion. For this reason the Department confines its activities to securing people of the type who will work on the land, either as farmers or farm labourers." Domestic helpers, it adds, are also particularly desired.

That has been the accepted policy of this country for a good many years past, and is the policy which, as stated in the extract, undoubtedly commends itself to us and to the great mass of Canadians as well.

I want to be perfectly frank and put everything before the Committee. A certain amount of apprehension was caused in the West, among our own members in the West, by the prominence given to a speech delivered by Hon. Mr. Forke in Toronto on the 24th November last. I know—we all do—how easy it is to be misreported, and how possibly one remark may be taken out of its context and given a totally different meaning; but in an address delivered in Toronto at that time, the Hon. Mr. Forke was reported to have said that we needed continental Europeans here to do the rough work. That was all that was stated, at all events in the Press. If that meant, of course, that it was to do the rough work in pioneering settlements, on the land, it was quite in accord with the policy of the Department, but when it came out in the Press in that way, it created in the minds of our western members an apprehension that the policy of the Department had been somewhat altered, and that continental Europeans had been brought in here to do rough manual labour other than that of agriculture. There is, of course, as this brochure so well says, there is bound to be in western Canada under the best of conditions for many years to come so much seasonal unemployment at the best of times that we all feel that we do not need non-agricultural labour imported into this country. I have heard it stated in public by officials of the Land Settlement Branch in the West that one of the difficulties that face the homesteader now is the fact that he cannot do as he did in the days before the War, when immigration was in full swing; he cannot go away and work on construction work for months at a time and make enough money with which to construct his buildings and equip his farm, his holding, consequently with that source of employment removed from the homesteader I think it is very necessary that we should be careful. Certainly the feeling of our members, rightly or wrongly, is almost unanimous, in the western provinces, on the point that non-agricultural labour should not be imported. As it is now, many of our farmers, at least a considerable number of them, not perhaps in proportion to the whole, are in the mines in winter. You will find a lot of farmers working there. I know several in my own acquaintance in Calgary, railway workers, who have farms, who leave their employment on the railway at certain seasons to work on their farms, having a man to work them during the regular season.

Another remark made by one of the Ministers which also caused a certain amount of misapprehension, at least of apprehension, rightly or wrongly, was in a report of a speech contained in a despatch from Montreal on October 4th last, by the Hon. Mr. Robb. He delivered—if it is not presumptuous for me to say so—a most excellent speech upon this question, but towards the conclusion of it he said there was idle land in the West, that he did not know whether the farmers there would remain if they had to pay the present high wages, because grain could not be profitably produced with wages at \$6 a day, and only by getting in more men could such wages be brought to a point where production could be made profitable. While complaints were made as to transportation costs, it actually cost as much to thresh the wheat as it cost to get it to the head of the lakes, 13 cents a bushel.

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

I am not a farmer, but in my work I am brought into daily contact with farmers in Alberta, and we all know, who live in the West, they have many many grave difficulties, but I have very rarely heard any farmer mention as one of his great difficulties the fact that he had to pay high wages. I may have heard it, but I cannot recall an instance where I have. I have heard of many other difficulties, but I have, as I said before, very rarely heard any of the farmers with whom I am brought into daily contact complain about the high rate of wages. Of course the \$5 and \$6 a day wage only applies during the harvesting season. The rest of the time the prevailing wage I think even for the best of men in our country is about \$50 a month and board. While \$5 and \$6 a day may seem very high for threshers' workmen and for harvesters, nevertheless when we have to bring into the country thousands and thousands of men for six weeks' work just before the setting in of winter, when the time of the commencement of winter may be very indefinite and may be unexpectedly early, as it was last year in Alberta, it seems to me that we can hardly expect those men to come unless we pay them a fairly high rate of wages, and the feeling of our members throughout the West, while we are thoroughly favourable to the importation of agricultural labour, wherever it may be needed, we do not wish to make it so numerous, to make the number of farm workers brought in so large that it will have the effect of depressing wages which, under all the present conditions in the West, are not excessive, and I do not think are complained of by farmers engaging farm help.

Furthermore, I think any reduction in wages would mean still further shutting down of the importation of British farm labour, because the wages which those men get on farms in England would be, everything considered, the shortness of hours, and that sort of thing, at least more attractive to them than the wages which we could present to them here, if there were any great reduction in the West at the present time. I may say quite frankly what perhaps I should have said at the opening, that I do not pretend to be (as the gentleman who gave evidence this morning) an expert in this matter. My work lies along other lines. I have taken a great deal of interest in it, and have devoted a good deal of study to it, and I am here only because the Command asked me to present the views of the Legion, in the hope that they might be of some assistance to you. There has been an impression, whether rightly or wrongly, throughout Saskatchewan, Alberta, and I think Manitoba as well, that for the past year or so, at least, frauds have been perpetrated upon the transportation companies, and upon the Government. The result has been that many men, coming here presumably as agricultural workers, have not been agricultural workers in their own country. In Alberta, investigations have shown that a considerable number of these people were not farm workers in the countries from which they came. Even those who were farm workers have been found to be engaged in other work, shortly after the time of their arrival. The effect on the labour market is, of course, obvious.

With all the difficulties that the farmer has to face, he is spared one difficulty which faces most of the rest of us; he does not have to compete with his neighbour. A Canadian farmer may be living on one farm, and next door to him may be a recently arrived Polish peasant, with a very much lower standard of living. The fact that these two men are both engaged on adjoining farms does not prejudice our own farmer at all; he is not brought into competition with him in that way. But the minute they get into the open labour market, non-agricultural work, then they are brought into competition at once, and the law of supply and demand will operate. Where your labour market is flooded in your cities and towns the man with the lower standard of living, who can live much more economically than our own people, is naturally at an advantage.

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. That has an equal application to the farm.—A. It would, to farm labour.

Q. To the farmer himself; he is producing in competition with the other farmer, and it would affect him to the same extent as it would the labour market?—A. In the west they sell mostly for world markets, as far as price is concerned. It might easily affect the man selling on a market in a large city.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. The standard of living of one class of people is lower than the other?—A. Absolutely. If that is correct it merely supports our contention all the more.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. My contention is that it applies to the farm just as much as it does to the city?—A. That supports our contention all the more.

In connection with the reports, which are received from our branches throughout the West, that these men have not stayed on the farm during the last year or so, or, at least, a great many of them have not stayed on the land, I might refer you to table No. 2 of the Report of the Department for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1927. We see there, with regard to immigration into the provinces, that for that year 36,700 odd immigrants were admitted into Manitoba; 20,000 into Saskatchewan, and 16,000 into Alberta. During the past two years there have been larger crop productions, and larger yields in Saskatchewan and Alberta; much better crops and much better farming conditions than have prevailed for the past year or so in Manitoba. One would be led to believe that farm immigration should be greater to Alberta and Saskatchewan than to Manitoba, but we find the reverse to be the case. For that year we find the total immigration into Manitoba to be twice as great as it was into Alberta.

Our branches report to us that a great many of these men are flooding the labour market in the city of Winnipeg, and that is, to some extent evidenced by the fact, as you have probably heard recently, that there has been somewhat acute unemployment in Winnipeg. Representations have been made to the Provincial Government that there are 1,500 men out of work in that city.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. They are mostly English speaking people?—A. Yes, quite possibly. I do not know whether they have recently arrived, but we contend that they have. We have somewhat the same condition, to a much lesser degree, in other towns in the west. We find that when these men all compete together on the labour market, the English speaking man may lose out in getting a job just as well as the other one, and he very often does.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Do you not think that in Manitoba, on account of mixed farming, they probably require more farm help than they do in Saskatchewan, where they are taking up larger farms and using bigger machinery and less men?—A. Well, that may be. I know that with good crops there is a great demand for farm labour in Alberta.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. That would apply to the fall of the year; the size of the crop would not make any difference during the rest of the year?—A. Oh, no, but I hardly think there should be that discrepancy. I want to be perfectly fair and candid, and I

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

think that some of it may be due to the fact that labourers who intended to go farther west are merely routed to Winnipeg. That may be true to a certain extent.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I think it would be just as well to say that they are routed to Winnipeg, and then supposed to be sent out west from Winnipeg. A good many of them stay over in Winnipeg and do not go west, and I suppose that is the reason.—
A. Yes. When one speaks on the question of unemployment, especially with reference to one's own town, one is apt to be misunderstood, and has to be careful. For the purpose of illustration, I am going to speak of the town which I know best, which is my own town—Calgary. I wish to say at the outset that we have no serious unemployment in Calgary, and have not had for some time. Calgary is booming; it is in excellent shape, much better shape than it has been since the war. It is not booming in any unpleasant sense, and there are no inflated values. It is a very steady growth; a great deal of building is going on, a great deal of money is being invested in big undertakings, and if we have reasonable luck with regard to crops, and a few more oil wells come in, within fifteen years we hope that our present population will be doubled. Naturally, in all our western towns, there is bound to be a certain amount of unemployment in the winter which, under present conditions, cannot be avoided. The fact that there is such unemployment need not for a minute discourage us from the point of view of general business conditions, but it is, none the less hard upon the individual concerned.

The report of our Saskatchewan Committee showed that during the year, ending before this report was made—which I presume would be the year ending 1927—more homestead entries were cancelled than were made. There were 5460 entered, and 5809 cancelled in the western provinces despite a fairly heavy immigration. It would appear from that, that either these immigrants are solely farm labourers, or else they are not staying at farm work at all.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. I suppose that not one percent of these men have the money to go on the farm?—A. That is the difficulty.

Q. They cannot even go on a homestead without some money?—A. That is the difficulty, sir.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Those that are cancelled are those that have left the country, and the five thousand are new men coming in to take up land. These homesteads have been empty for three or four years, and then they are cancelled?—A. They are not the same men, of course, but over a period of years I submit that it shows, at all events, that we are not having any more homestead entries.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Are we bringing them as fast as they are going out?—A. That would appear to be the case. Our Saskatchewan Committee, estimating the natural increase in population for a ten-year period ending 1925, estimated that 115,000 people left Saskatchewan during that ten-year period. The census reports for 1926, as compared with 1921, show that we are not keeping pace with our natural increase, plus immigration, in the western provinces.

Q. Is that not so for the whole Dominion?—A. I think it is quite possible.

Q. Have we not lost about 75,000?—A. Quite probably.

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. You stated that with reasonable prosperity Calgary hoped to double its population in the next couple of years?—A. I said fifteen years.

Q. In the next few years?—A. I said fifteen years, sir.

Q. I suppose that would apply equally to most of the western cities and towns, they are all increasing?—A. I think Calgary has a little better chance than some of the others.

Q. They all hope to increase along about the same ratio. Where do you expect to get that additional population?—A. I think that the increased population comes, to a great extent, from the children on the farms, like the population of any other city.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. You are not saying that the entire west is going to grow the same as Calgary? Many towns in the west will not have any more population fifteen years hence than they have now?—A. Oh, no, especially the smaller towns.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Do you say that the urban population will increase more rapidly than the rural, in spite of immigration?—A. The natural tendency all over Canada, and I think all over the world, is for the urban population to show a greater increase than the rural, because of the present tendency of modern life. In these days of good roads, your distributing centres are covering a much larger area all the time. Your larger cities are, I think, bound to grow to a considerable extent, but your small towns will suffer appreciably in the same way. The same thing applies in the province of Ontario where the old, small villages of twenty years ago are a thing of the past. The county towns have taken the business away from them, and the larger cities have also, because transportation is so much better.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. But the urban population has increased materially in the last ten years?—A. I think it has in the cities and towns. I think the urban population can look after itself because of the natural drift, so to speak. I have heard some of the departmental officials in western Canada say that there are people there not fitted for farm work, although born and brought up on one. They seek other means of making a living.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Would there not also be people born in the cities naturally fitted to drift to the farms?—A. There are and I intend to submit that later to the Committee.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. Is it not largely an economic question? Will they not go where they can make the best living?—A. Within certain limitations, sir. Some man might make more money at a line of work which he does not altogether find to his liking, because of the surroundings.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Apparently it is their choice and selection?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. My point is that if a farm is made as attractive as it should be there would not be that drift to the cities, but there probably would be a drift from

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

the cities to the farms.—A. As far as we are concerned we think that should be encouraged in every possible way. I have no doubt the Committee has had these figures before, but in the last five years the increase in Saskatchewan was 63,000, in Alberta 19,000, and in Manitoba 29,000. That is the total population shown by the census returns from 1921 to 1926.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. That is not the natural increase?—A. Not the natural increase plus immigration, no.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Is that the natural increase?—A. Probably about the natural increase, with the exception of Alberta, which I think would be more than that.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. Saskatchewan would certainly have an increase of more than 29,000.—A. There were 63,000 in Saskatchewan, 19,000 in Alberta, and 29,000 in Manitoba. I think Manitoba and certainly Alberta would be below the mark.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. Have you the population figures for Canada since Confederation, which apparently prove the same thing. I heard this put on Hansard three or four years ago, beginning at Confederation, and it showed that during this time Canada had not maintained its natural increase.—A. There is no question about that. In 1920 the United States census reported that there were 1,177,878 Canadian born in the United States and at the present time there are 48,027, disability pensions in force as a result of the Great War, paid by the Government through the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment. Of those 49,000 pensions, 4,793, or practically 10 per cent are paid in the United States, and it is estimated by investigations which have been made by the officials of our Service Bureau for several years past that the number of ex-service men who are physically fit, who have gone to the United States, would be larger in proportion than those who are suffering from pensionable disability.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. You said 1,800,000 Canadians in the United States?—A. 1,177,000.

Q. Is there any record to show what line of business those Canadian born are employed in in the United States? Are many of them farming or located in the urban centres of the United States?—A. Not that I know of. I should imagine most of them are in the urban centres. I should think very few of them were farming.

Q. That would make it appear that the urban problem of the Dominion is not keeping pace with the rural problem.—A. Except that we have had some growth in the larger cities. There were 550,000 men in the army, and 50,000 were killed. If 500,000 Canadians came back from the war, and if there is the same percentage of fit soldiers as there are pensionable soldiers in the United States, then 50,000 of our returned soldiers are in the United States at the present time, which is really a very conservative estimate because our investigations have led us to believe that the percentage of fit men would be greater than the number of unfit.

Now, to refer a moment, if I may, to this question of unemployment in Calgary. I will preface my remarks by saying that it is not a matter of bad conditions. Quite the reverse. It is the inevitable seasonal unemployment, but none the less hard on the individual. Our Calgary branch inserted a notice in the newspapers asking all returned men who had no work and wanted work

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

to register, last January. Just one notice, with one insertion; no other effort made to get them, and we have in the Calgary office the names, regimental numbers and units of 250 men who registered as being out of work and who were anxious to do any kind of work for which they were physically fit.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. On what date?—A. During the month of January.

Q. Did you try that in July?—A. No, it would be less then. January is a bad month. I think there are fewer now. Mind you, a great many of them were not in any great want at the moment, but they were living on their savings, many of them, and they were idle and did want work. Now, at the same time, 251 recently arrived Hungarians, all of whom had arrived in the last preceding 18 months, the great majority in the past preceding year, were visited at various houses in Calgary. Only 10 of them were working. They said that they had been promised when they left their own country, wages of from \$20 to \$25 per week upon reaching Winnipeg. To their eternal credit be it said that they were not asking for any charity; those who had work were sharing with the others, but they were living on bread and coffee at that time.

Q. Did they say who made the promises?—A. No, they did not. They said the people who had brought them out from their own country.

Q. Did they all make the same statement?—A. No, not all of them, but a great many of them did, speaking presumably for all of them. Every individual was not asked that question, so far as I know. They may have been but I don't know of it.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. Would it not be important to find out on an occasion of that kind, who had made these promises?—A. Well, they said all they knew was that they were brought out for continental Europe, and that was the promise made to them on the continent.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. That would probably be by the railway or steamship companies?—A. I presume they are all under the railway agreement.

Q. You are not blaming the Department for that?—A. No. I am not trying to apportion blame on anyone, gentlemen. I do not want to indulge in any carping criticism or make any charges.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Was that the month of January this year?—A. Yes.

Q. This 251 had just come out?—A. Within the previous 18 months.

Q. They were not in charge of the steamship company which had brought them?—A. Not at that time.

Q. They would be brought out by the steamship companies?—A. Presumably so—under the agreement.

Q. You did not find that out?—A. As far as I recollect, no. As I say, they were brought out here, and since the continental immigration from these countries is, as I understand it, altogether in the hands of the transportation companies, I presume they were responsible. I do not want to dam anyone, but those were the wages they said they were to get in Winnipeg. The point I wish to stress is that they were here and out of work.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Would that condition not be more or less relieved as the farms opened up?—A. To a great extent, but I submit that where we have this seasonal

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

unemployment of our own, we should take steps not to accentuate it. These men should be kept on the farms in some way or other.

By Mr. Young (Saskatoon):

Q. During this last summer did you have any overplus of labour in Calgary?—A. No, I do not think so.

Q. As a matter of fact, was it not the case that in many western cities there was so much work that they were really trying to get more workmen than were available.—A. In the cities?

Q. Yes.—A. They wanted carpenters and builders. I do not know whether they particularly wanted anybody else.

Q. I know that in Saskatoon there was so much work going on that it was really difficult at times to get men, and I think that was pretty generally true in Western Canada. We all know that in January there is a great deal of seasonal unemployment.—A. Absolutely. That is exactly what I say. I said we should take pains not to accentuate it by bringing out men who are very shortly out of work and flooding the labour market.

Q. What is your suggestion as to how to supply the necessary labour during the seasons when they require a great deal of labour?—A. I submit we should import only farm labour, and the other will take care of itself. I submit that a great many of these men—from our investigations—have never been on a farm or have only been there a very, very short time, even in the Summer.

Q. Could you show the Committee the man who had been brought out here by the transportation companies and the colonization agencies—which are presumably bringing people for farm labour and to go on the farm—could you show that these companies are not putting this labour on the farms? We have had positive statements on the other side, and I would like to have you give us information if you can that these men are not doing farm labour and are not being put on the farm.—A. From my own observation I have seen any number of these men around the streets of Calgary very soon after they came. They may have been shipped to the farms in the first instance, but they did not stay there very long.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Do you not think that by bringing out nothing but farm labour, you can soon go into the cities and you find many men there in the building trades who came out as farm labourers, and after being there a while decided not to stay on the farms because competition was greater on the farm? They were seeking the wages paid in the towns and the cities. If you will pardon the personal reference, right to-day I am building a home, and we cannot get carpenters to go out in the country to work on that home. They want to live in the cities and build city residences.—A. That would apply to the men who had learned trades.

Q. They are not all tradesmen working to-day at trades in the country?—A. Perhaps not.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. If there was that demand for labour in the western cities, what is the difference?—A. I do not think, outside the building trades that there is any tremendous demand for unskilled labour in the Western cities at this time, or last year. Certainly it has not been our experience at all. And the point is that when you get to unskilled labour—especially in the winter, when there is not very much employment, these men who have a lower standard of living, who come out presumably for the farm, but do not stay there, compete unfairly with our own men; and to my mind, it is bad business, even for those of us who are

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

not labourers at all, men engaged in business or professions, to lower the wage scale of the men lower down, because the minute they go down, the rest of us suffer. The people as a whole suffer. I might read a letter written to the Dominion Command by the Provincial Secretary of our Legion in Alberta. It is dated January 9, 1928, and reads as follows:—

Re *E. Schwesinger*

The above named man, whose identification card shows that he registered on Return 35, line 4; that he arrived at Quebec on September 23, 1927, and is stranded here in Calgary, and says that he came from Hamburg, Germany, being promised lots of work here as an interpreter by the Canadian Pacific Railway agent. On the same ship, so he states, there were about seven hundred other immigrants, mostly Russian.

I think it well to draw your attention to this because I am satisfied the Government is being deceived.

Yours fraternally,

(Signed) A. WAKELYN,
Provincial Secretary.

We have also reason to believe that there has been a somewhat free and perhaps improper use of nomination papers under the assisted-passage scheme; that men are making these nominations in a somewhat wholesale manner, without being in a bona fide way responsible for them.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Is that under the assisted passage scheme?—A. The railways assisted-passage.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: That is the only assisted-passage scheme we have in Britain.

WITNESS: As far as the Government is concerned. In continental immigration, the nominations are placed, as I understand it, with the railway companies in the same way. I have here a copy which I made myself, and therefore I can vouch for it being a correct one, of an affidavit, or statutory declaration, made on the 8th of February, 1928, before the Police Magistrate of Calgary. (Reading):

That during the months of November and December, 1926, at Calgary, in the office of the Hungarian Colonization Board, I was asked by a Mr. Crerar—

that is a lawyer in Calgary, no relation to Hon. Mr. T. A. Crerar—

to sign five C.P. nomination papers for immigrants from Hungary, and Czecho-Slovakia. Mr. Schwartz, in charge of the office, told me where to sign. At the time, I was working in the office. I had been a bank clerk in Hungary. I came to Calgary from Europe on the 7th of September, 1926. In the office in January, 1927, Mr. Crerar signed the nominations, and got me to witness his signature.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Who signed those papers, did you say?—A. Mr. Crerar, and Mr. Schwartz, who are the men in charge of this office.

Q. Who is Mr. Schwartz?—A. Another gentleman in the office of the Hungarian Colonization Board. There were certain charges—I say this without prejudice—I believe they were subsequently dismissed—but there were certain charges made against these two men, Crerar and Schwartz, which were aired in the Calgary police Court about a year ago.

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Did this man get him to sign nomination papers?—A. Yes, he signed five from Hungary and Czecho-Slovakia. He signed them himself, this man who makes the affidavit says.

Q. Without knowing who they were for?—A. As far as he knew, no. The Association may have.

Q. What happened to them when it came out?—A. I do not know what happened to them.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. They were signed on behalf of that Hungarian Association?—A. Yes.

Q. And the Hungarian Association had given them a guarantee for the employment of these people, that I take it to be the explanation?—A. My submission is this: that it might be worthy of some inquiry, that in that case surely it was not necessary to ask the clerk in the office to make the nominations. That seems to me an improper manner of doing business, because he himself knew nothing apparently about it, but did what he was told by his employers.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Have you any other instances of the same nature?—A. No, I have none of the same nature, sir, at the moment. Now, many of our branches—and I do not think it can be denied—say that the railway section gangs in the West are composed almost exclusively of foreigners; and that a great many of them are newly arrived foreigners. It may be said that the Englishman or the English-speaking Canadian, in fact, the Canadian, will not go on the railway. I think many of us have had experience with certain types of Central European labour newly arrived here, and can quite readily understand why an English or French-speaking labourer cannot live in quarters with say, the newly arrived Pole. I think that is fairly evident. I had some experience of that kind myself years ago in certain work I was doing while a college student. The work was at St. Lambert where we had French and English Canadians and Polacks. Our men refused to live with the Polacks, and the Polacks were refused at the labourers' boarding houses; they had newly arrived, and their standard of living was so far below that of our people.

Q. Do you know anything of these men yourself, or can you give instances?—A. I can give you an incident of my own knowledge as far as it goes. Coming down on the train a week ago last Saturday, between Bassano and Brook in Alberta, the train stopped; there was certain construction work going on, putting plates under the track, and people working along the line. The train stopped, and about twenty obviously newly-arrived foreigners came along. They did not tell me they were foreigners, but you can generally tell these chaps, the mystified and interested expression, and so on. They got off the train, and I am morally certain of the fact from their appearance, and the nature of the bundles they carried and so on, that those chaps had arrived, very, very recently. We have reports at various branches that that is the case.

Q. Were these men going to work on the farms, or on the railway?—A. They all walked down the tracks and got with this working crew there. This particular crowd did.

Q. Would you say that their arrival was expected?—A. There were a lot of work-cars down the railway, and these men were met there.

Now, I have a letter here from our Branch in Rocky Mountain House, which I might perhaps read, because it expresses the viewpoint of our Branches as a whole. It is addressed to the Provincial Secretary of the Canadian Legion at Calgary—(Reading):

DEAR SIR AND COMRADE: With reference to the paragraph on immigration in your circular letter of the 11th ultimo.

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

At the last meeting of this Branch, the following resolution was passed:

Whereas, a large number of Central Europeans are being continually brought into this country, and are obtaining work, often to the detriment of ex-service men, and whereas the standard of living of these peoples is lower than of our native-born citizens, and these people are willing to work for a lower wage, thereby preventing British citizens from obtaining employment, therefore Be it Resolved, that we greatly deplore the influx of Central Europeans into Canada, and that we suggest that the number of immigrants from these countries be strictly limited, and that an effort be made to obtain immigrants from the British Isles and from the Scandinavian countries, instead.

While I personally have no definite information on this subject, several members cited cases of which they had some knowledge.

He then mentions a lumber company; I am quite prepared to give the name to the Committee if it is requested, but, unless requested, I will not mention it. Then he continues. (Reading):

They employ the cheapest labour they can obtain, and are claimed to have hired a large number of Central Europeans during the last winter.

N.B.—I omitted this sentence in reading the letter, H. C. Farthing.

This class of labour is largely employed on the section crews and extra-gangs. When one of these peoples joins one of these crews usually the Britisher has to get out.

The day before I left Calgary, the Secretary of our Provincial Command had just returned from a visit to the Crow's Nest Pass, to our branches there in the mines of the Crow's Nest Pass district. He said that there was a very considerable amount of complaint among the English-speaking miners and our returned soldiers there, because of the fact that more and more foreigners were becoming mine-foremen, and that they would not give employment to English-speaking men, and that there was very considerable complaint on the part of our miners in the Crow's Nest Pass.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. What is your opinion as to the real cause of this condition? Is it due to the free immigration of foreigners into Canada?—A. I think so. I think it has that effect.

Q. It is quite apparent from the figures you have given, and your view of the whole situation that those who desire a higher standard of living, whether they are brought in through immigration, or born in Canada, go to the South, to the United States, and their place is taken by continentals who are satisfied with a lower standard of living?—A. Exactly. I think that is the unfortunate effect it appears to have, because the States is doing everything it can, apparently, to keep the standard of living up.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. On the point that you are now discussing, is it not the fact that the exodus to the United States has practically ceased?—A. Yes, I think it has. Or at least, I do not think it is as large as it used to be. At the same time, it has been pretty bad, and if the same conditions prevail, it will be bad again, if our present prosperity has a set-back of any kind.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. From your observation and your knowledge of the community, can you say whether a number of men from continental Europe are being brought into this

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

country by steamship companies, and land colonization companies, who are not going on the farms, but are simply going into the cities?—A. That is the report we have, sir, yes, and these are the complaints which are made.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. When you say brought in by steamship companies, and so on, would you put it, by the Liberal Government?—A. Whoever is responsible. Those are the complaints that have been made to us.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Do you find much demand in Western Canada for immigration?—A. Well, that is a straight question. I cannot find any over-powering demand for it on the part of the people as a whole.

Q. Who is demanding it, the farmer, or the employer of labour?—A. I do not think the farmer is demanding it. In fact, our farm organizations passed a very strong resolution against it. Personally, I have not altogether agreed with those resolutions, but I must confess, since you ask me the straight question, that I do not know of any great demand on the part of Western Canada for any great immigration at the present time.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Do you believe that most of the immigrants go into Western Canada?—A. From the reports we have, it would appear to be so, yes.

Q. But it is really not in response to a very general demand for it in Western Canada?—A. I do not think there is any tremendous demand on the part of the people in the West. I do not think the people are worried particularly about it to any considerable extent. Mind you, I think all the people feel that we should see the country more settled than it is at the present time. I think every one feels that. But as to whether there is any great demand for an aggressive immigration policy just at this moment, without any regard to my own opinions on the subject, I must confess that I have not seen any great evidence of it in Western Canada.

By Mr. Fansher:

Q. Have any of the farmers' organizations passed a resolution asking for more immigrants?—A. I cannot recall any.

Q. Not for a number of years.—A. Our whole stand—in opening I said that I did not want to be misunderstood—is that the proportion of British be kept up, but I cannot recall any such resolution.

Q. Have you heard of any resolutions passed against the immigration policy that is now in vogue?—A. I would not want to take my oath as to the person, but I have seen and heard that they have been passed, and I have read in the Press that they have been passed by various United Farmers' organizations. I could not tell you the name of any organization, or whether it is a provincial organization or not, but I know it has been passed by some organization, but whether provincial or local I could not say.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Do you think that if we bring in more immigrants we will crowd our own people out?—A. That is what we are afraid of. There has been a loss if the United States immigration laws are being enforced; we must be losing our own people.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. When our population was three or four millions, the percentage of people who went to the States was very much larger than it is now?—A. That is true. The proportion is falling all the time.

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

Hon. Mr. FORKE This gentleman refers to a high pressure immigration policy. I want to make it plain that outside the British Isles, as far as the Immigration Department is concerned, there is certainly no high pressure immigration policy from Central Europe. If there was a high pressure policy for continental immigrants, we could have them by the hundreds of thousands here. But there is no high pressure policy on the part of the Immigration Department, to bring continental Europeans to Canada.

WITNESS: I do not think the loss is as great to the United States as it was in former years. It appears to be coming down again now. Undoubtedly the American official figures are of people who have entered the United States legally. The figures I quoted a short time ago take no account of people who are bootlegged over the border. We must be losing a great many people of our own blood, and their places are obviously taken by people who cannot enter the United States.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. I think you had better go on?—A. All right, sir, I will omit what I was going to say further on this point. I might just say this, that there is a gentleman here now, a Captain Caulfield, who is the Chairman of the north-eastern area of the British Legion, and who lives in Newcastle; he has been sent to Canada by the British Legion to investigate the possibility of British, chiefly ex-service men, settling in Canada. He is now in Alberta, and I am sorry he is not here to-day. He says his enquiries lead him to believe that sixty per cent of the mine labour is foreign at the present time. As far as Alberta is concerned, I do not see any immediate prospect of employing any great large body of British mine labour in Alberta at the present time.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Do you know any market that is more overstocked with labour in Alberta than the mines?—A. No, I do not. What Captain Caulfield hopes is this; coming down to immigration, we may hope that if it is considered necessary to encourage immigration to any great extent, and if we are to keep our proportion of British up, our Alberta branches have asked that fifty per cent of immigration be either English speaking or French speaking. Manitoba has asked for seventy per cent. What the Dominion Convention will do as to the exact percentage, I do not know. If any of the members of the Committee have time to read the Saskatchewan report, our office will be only too glad to supply it. It is really an excellent report. I think Hon. Mr. Forke has referred to it in the Committee before as being a very comprehensive report. They all submit a quota system of some kind, fifty per cent English and French speaking, and varying from that to seventy per cent. If it is necessary to keep up that quota and to keep up the required amount of immigration, to increase the number of Britishers coming to this country, then I would submit that we should not lay too much stress upon the necessity of their coming from English farms. I have heard officials of the department say in the West that some of the most successful farmers and some of the most successful families that have come under the three thousand scheme at present in vogue have not had any farm experience. I have also heard people say in public speeches that in some cases people who have resided on farms are not fitted for them, by temperament, and that they find people from cities who take to farming like a duck takes to water.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Those people are very carefully selected both as to general appearance and intelligence.—A. I know they are.

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

Q. Both as to general appearance and intelligence?—A. I think that Lord Clarendon said it was one of the most successful schemes of modern times. The then Premier Greenfield, speaking before the Ottawa Canadian Club in 1924, said:—

Get the idea out of your mind that it is essential to have agricultural experience to make good on the land in western Canada. I had none. I have five farmers and a farmer's wife in the Alberta Cabinet. They have all done fairly well on the farm, and none of them had any previous experience. Major Strange, who won the wheat championship at Chicago last year, was a green Britisher. The man who won it this year—I think his name is Mitchell—was a cotton spinner from Manchester; he did not have any previous experience in farming.

I am told that Mr. Seagur Wheeler of Saskatchewan, is another town-bred man; he has won the prizes for wheat in Chicago. There are many other instances.

Pardon a personal reference. Just before leaving Calgary I did some work for two particular clients of mine; there was one who came here as a young man of nineteen or twenty and took up a farm; he was anxious to buy a new one. Some four or five other men were anxious to get the farm, but I succeeded in getting it for him solely on his standing as a farmer. That is significant. Another case is that of a young man of twenty-eight or twenty-nine at present, a young man brought up in Baltimore, Maryland. His father was not a farmer but a clergyman. He came out to the West, bought a farm near Nanton and after six or seven years, at twenty-nine years of age, having made an extensive study of his particular branch of farming, I find that he took the first two prizes for Hereford bulls at the recent show at Calgary, and that one brought the highest price ever paid for a Hereford bull in the history of the show. These are a couple of instances in point, and there are many more.

Captain Caulfield says that these miners have all certain little garden plots of their own, and with a certain amount of instruction and help could be made very useful men on farms. I, myself, can vouch for the handworking qualities of the British miner. There are 200,000 of them unemployed in England at the present time, who cannot be absorbed in their own industry. When in France on the Somme I had a working party of 100 Welsh miners, Bantams, undersized, a labour battalion. They were unloading barges. I must confess that I never heard more graphic language than those men could use, but I never saw harder workers. They were regular demons for work. One little chap of about ninety pounds were unloading oats; he said, "Those bags are bigger than I am, sir," and he was working like a fiend to get the work done.

I submit that these men could be made very useful immigrants. Another suggestion we would make is that some trace be kept of newly arrived continental immigrants, and others as well, and if it be found that people of any particular country, a year or two after their arrival, cannot be kept on the farms, if they do not want to stay, if we find that to any great extent they are not staying on the farms as farm workers, we suggest that those countries be shut off from immigration altogether.

As far as the general aspect of assimilation goes, we think the number of British should be kept up, because I think it is obvious that while we can assimilate foreigners we cannot assimilate them unless we have something for them to assimilate with. The Ukrainians in Calgary are friends of mine. Their whole plea is that they want to do more, and to become Canadians, to know more about the language. They are living with English speaking people, and are doing so.

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

It has been suggested by certain witnesses that we have in certain parts of the West blocks where people of certain nationalities outnumber those of our own people. If we have them in too large numbers we cannot possibly hope to assimilate them. One man, a Ukrainian friend of mine, came out at seven years of age. Under proper conditions he should be able to speak English as well as anybody, but he speaks English in a very broken way. It is a great disadvantage to him, as a matter of fact. I suppose you have all read of the Manitoba School Trustee Case, in which Judge Stacpoole said that a school trustee need not read or write English as long as he could read a European language. The significant part of that is that such a man could be elected as a school trustee at all.

In regard to a question asked me outside the Committee room with reference to assimilation; I do not mean intermarriage; that will follow later on, as a matter of course.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Where did that school case take place?—A. Somewhere in Manitoba. Judge Stacpoole was the Judge. I am sorry I have forgotten the name of the town.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Could all those Welshmen you spoke of speak English?—A. The vast majority of them could. The vast majority of them could speak very graphic English, too. Of course Captain Caulfield has a lot of Northumbrians and Durham men, from the northeast.

We would also suggest an increased use of the British Settlement Scheme. There is money in England which is available. I am quite sure that if the government should embark upon any comprehensive scheme of a new nature in regard to settlement, we have every reason to believe that the English government would be willing to furnish us with financial assistance. As a matter of fact, we think that British immigration should be encouraged on three grounds. The first ground is that of sentiment; people of our own language and blood, and so on. The second is that they stay with us. Our office here in Ottawa has made an analysis from the census tables of 1901 and 1921, and of the total British immigration for the twenty-year period, 60 per cent apparently remained in Canada; of foreign immigration, for the same twenty-year period, only 48 per cent remained in Canada, and of United States immigration only 23 per cent remained in Canada. Those are the facts, and show that our British settlers will stick. As to the question as to whether or not they are good in the bush at clearing, or anything of that kind, I do not live anywhere near the Peace River but I could name several men whom I know, Canadians and Englishmen, and they are pioneering in the Peace River district. We have some flourishing branches of our own Legion there. I am told that the Ontario Government gives certain loans to farmer settlers in New Ontario, and that there are more British born getting those loans at the present time, than any other nationality, even those born in Canada.

A questionnaire was sent out by this Committee in Saskatchewan, and I would just like to read the report. These were sent out to the branches in Saskatchewan:

No difference of opinion was voiced with regard to the following question:

Do you desire to deal with an argument usually advanced on behalf of the admission of foreign born immigrant labour, namely, that a large annual influx of these men is indispensable for the rougher part of railway construction and operation, and the clearing of our bush lands, because, it is stated, Anglo-Saxons will not under-

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

take tasks of that kind? Is this contention valid as regards your locality?

Every branch by whom an answer was given, answered, "No." Additional remarks explain and to a degree qualify this reply. A selection is quoted: "all bush work up here is done by Anglo-Saxons." "There is no reason why Anglo-Saxons will not do this work if paid a white-man's wage." "Not valid as regards this locality." "Anglo-Saxons in this district seem to have no hesitation in doing this work on their own farms." "Our experience with foreign born immigrants is that the majority of them will not clear bush lands." "Plenty of British born labourers could be found if the railways would pay a white man's wage." "Nonsense: Anglo-Saxons have been clearing here for twenty years." "The Anglo-Saxons will stand with the rest, and then some." "We suggest British unemployed can handle this work." "The main difficulty seems to be that the British prefer not to work in contact with foreigners." That last has reference to the central Continental; they do not object to working with the Danes, Norwegians or Germans.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Do you say there that the foreigners would not clear bush farms?—A. That is what one branch said, sir. "Our experience with foreign born immigrants is that the majority of them will not clear bush lands."

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Has your organization made any study of the economic consequences to business in general, by bringing in people with a lower standard of living?—A. We have made no intensive study, sir. I think it is fairly obvious that when people do, as my polack friends did years ago, such a thing as going to the butcher and getting meat he could not sell to anybody else, and having it given to them, their purchasing is not particularly high.

Q. Their purchases of manufactured articles would not be as high?—A. I do not think there is any doubt about it. A poor standard of living would lower your purchasing power.

Q. The reaction would be poorer business conditions if you bring in a large percentage of these people?—A. It would affect the merchant, the retailers, and also the professional men.

Q. Would it even affect the railways? Assume that these people did produce as many bushels of grain, or produced as much agricultural products, would the railways get the hauling of as much finished goods back to these people, if we bring in people with a lower standard?—A. Certainly not, until we assimilate them and get them up to our standard of living, and you cannot do that until the next generation.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. In view of the fact that you made the statement that the urban centres are about filled up, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Immigration has made the statement that in the future we can only hope for the Continental to take up farm labouring and farm pioneering and colonization, where would you expect the British immigrants to go? Our industrial activities have all the men they require and, as the Minister of Immigration says, only the Continental can be interested in rural life at the present time?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I never made any remark of that kind.

Mr. ROWE: I thought it was something along that line.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I am a rural man myself, and I would not change places with any city man, if I get through with this job.

Mr. ROWE: I think the hon. Minister said a few days ago that in the future the Continentals would be doing the pioneering work on the farms?

HON. MR. FORKE: I do not think that I ever said that either. What I did say was that it was of no advantage to Canada to have a Continental farmer come and take the place of an Anglo-Saxon.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Is it not a fact that the standard of living on the farm does not seem to be attractive to the Britisher at the present time?—A. It used to be attractive, and it is still attractive. From the evidence which has been given before the Committee, in recent years there seems to be the idea in England that the Britisher is not wanted in this country. I am absolutely in the dark as to the cause of that, far more, probably, than any of you gentlemen are. It is quite possible, as was suggested this morning, that no one person or organization in Canada is responsible for that in any way, but it seems to me that we should try to meet that. I might read you a letter which was received here in Ottawa, dated April 16th, 1928, from Captain Donald Simson, the Secretary of the British Empire Service League. (Reads):

DEAR SIR,—We have many applications from men who wish to go to Canada but are unable to do so for two main reasons:

- (1) That they have no work to go to.
- (2) That they cannot afford the full fare.

As you know, assisted passages under the Empire Settlement Act, are only granted to men nominated to work on the land. We can usually supply the right men, but so far, have not been in a position to obtain nominations.

We therefore, suggest that it might be possible, through your various branches, to obtain a number of nominations, and if you think it worth while, we suggest you make it known throughout the Canadian Legion.

If a farmer needs a man, or a man and his family, and applies to you, stating the age and class of man required, wages and accommodation offered and what would be expected of the wife, we would endeavour to secure, by personal interview, the right type of man. We would then communicate with you and give particulars of the man recommended, for the information of the farmer, and, if the latter agrees to accept him, all that the farmer would have to do, would be to lodge the nomination in the usual way and an assisted passage would follow in due course.

You may rest assured that we would only recommend men likely to make good citizens in Canada and who can produce good references and who are physically fit. We would in all cases personally interview the applicants. We would also be prepared to recommend and assist the sons of ex-servicemen, as possibly, in some cases, only young men would be required.

Apart from land work, we would also be prepared to recommend men for any particular trade, if you could induce prospective employers to state their requirements to you. In this case, assisted passages could not be granted, but we would be prepared to consider granting assistance towards the full fare.

If, with your co-operation, we can bring these suggestions to a successful issue, we will be in a position to help many unemployed ex-servicemen of the best type to settle in Canada.

Your faithfully,

DONALD SIMSON,
Hon. Secretary.

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

Through our connection with the Legion in the Old Country, I am instructed to say that we will be only too glad to co-operate in any way we can with the Department in any policy which may be embarked on.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. What is your experience with regard to unemployed from the British Isles? Have you had many complaints of British immigrants being unable to get work, or having work taken from them by the immigrants from Continental Europe undercutting them in wages?—A. We have complaints of that nature, not so much with regard to the newly arrived British immigrant, but with regard to the person who has been here for some years, or the Canadian born. A great many of our members, as the Western members of the Committee will know, in Western Canada are British born. The complaints from many places are that these Continental immigrants are competing unfairly with our own people, not necessarily with the newly arrived British immigrant. The newly arrived British immigrant, I think, is pretty well placed on the land at the present time. We have had very little complaint from the British immigrant who comes out for farm work. Our branches help them in every possible way, and they are pretty well looked after.

Q. You have had complaints from Canadians, then?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. That the immigrant from Continental Europe is cutting work out from under his hand by offering his labour at a price below that which would enable the Canadian born to exist?—A. We have had one complaint where a foreigner in a town in the west offered to supply any number up to 100 farm workers at \$20 per month and board, which was below the usual wage at that time of the year in that particular locality.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. They would be newcomers?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. He offered to supply 100 workers?—A. Offered to supply anything up to 100. He ran a sort of employment agency.

Q. At \$20 per month?—A. At \$20 per month and board.

Q. That would be for farm labour?—A. Yes.

Q. Continentals?—A. Presumably they would be Continental farm workers.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. What time of year was this?—A. That was, I think, in the Autumn, but I cannot swear to it. It was away from the harvest season. It was below the rate of wages prevailing in that particular locality at that particular time.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Is it not a fact that the foreigner for the most part is not given to working for low wages, but is asking for the same wages as the other? Is he not anxious to get all he possibly can and is asking for the going wages?—A. Yes, he is not backward about it, but the law of supply and demand operates. I know a returned English soldier who has lived for some years in this country, and worked all last summer on the farm. He has a wife and two small children and during this winter has worked as a pin boy in a bowling alley in Calgary at \$10 a week. I will admit he is not the brightest chap in the world, but that is a case of a chap who is willing to work and has earned good pay in the past. I would suggest that colonization as well as immigration be considered by this Committee.

Discussion followed.

[Mr. Hugh Farthing.]

Hon. Mr. FORKE: By an agreement this morning between Hon. Mr. Ralston and Mr. Chamberlain, there is letter dated March 10, 1924, which Mr. Chamberlain desired to have in the record in connection with his evidence.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Brown), that may be included.

Witness retired.

Discussion followed.

The Committee adjourned until May 3rd, at 11 a.m.

Mr. [Name] (Mr. [Name])

Discussion followed

Page 500

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, May 3, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

C. A. MAGRATH, called and sworn.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think Mr. Magrath needs any introduction as he is well known to the members of the Committee.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee: When I was asked by the Secretary of your Committee to be here to-day, I appreciated the opportunity, for the simple reason that I am, as a citizen of this country, interested in the question of colonization.

Doubtless, the reason for inviting me here is that last week there appeared in one of the local papers certain articles from my pen, dealing with Canada and colonization. It is rather difficult for me to attempt to discuss the matter with you, in view of these recent statements of mine, because I do not wish to go over the same ground. That would be tiring to those of you who have read the articles.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. But your articles are not in evidence, and your statement will be.—
A. It would be, as I say, more or less tiring. I would suggest that those of you who have not read the articles should do so.

I think that I understand something about the problem. The reason I say that is that for many years I have lived amongst new people, newcomers to Canada; I have seen the conditions under which they have endeavoured to settle themselves in this country; I have seen the trials and tribulations of their womenkind, and, because of that, I feel that I have some right to discuss the subject. I have seen the dugout conditions under which settlers in western Canada have endeavoured to establish themselves and, for my part, I think that we in Canada have not a proper appreciation of what the newcomer means to this country. He must be an asset, otherwise we do not want him, and, because of his being an asset, I feel that we ought to extend to him the greatest possible consideration.

It is difficult to go over the ground, unless I attempt to follow what I have set out in these recent articles, which I do not propose doing. I am not coming here to criticize the Minister or his Department; I am not coming here to criticize our railways, because I believe and know that they are being conducted by intelligent people who are doing the best they can within the limits of the system under which they are operating. I think that is a reasonable statement to make. There is too much criticism about what these agencies are trying to do, whereas we should be devoting our time to determining for ourselves whether the system under which we are operating is a sound one.

We say that we want more people. If, under the present system, the type of people that we want costs us more than we are prepared to pay, because they are an asset, then the only thing we can do is to endeavour to get a cheaper type of people—if we want more people. I imagine that that has been

[Mr. C. A. Magrath.]

the problem that those engaged in colonization have been up against. If we want more money, then, as I see it, we have got to be prepared to use our credit to a greater extent in getting the people. If the banks want to enlarge their premises, there is only one thing to do, and that is to be prepared to spend more money. If the railways want to expand their branch line system, they have to spend more money. If we are looking for people who are to be an asset to this country, then I believe that we have got to change the system and be prepared to lend our credit to a greater extent than we have been doing.

I am proceeding on the assumption that we do want more people. I think, in looking at that problem, that we ought to keep in mind the national point of view. That is the only point of view that I have had in connection with colonization—the responsibility of the citizen to-day to the future of this country. There is a commercial point of view, though I will say very frankly that I believe those who are engaged in commerce have the national point of view. Doubtless, they are influenced to a certain extent by the commercial aspect, but I am looking at this problem entirely from the national standpoint—the responsibility of the state to those who follow.

Last year we devoted a deal of thought to the men who founded this confederation. At that time we were pleased to give credit to them for their vision. The glass was pretty dark in their day, and yet they had the vision to see what the future held for this country. The glass is not at all dark to-day, because we have ascertained facts to guide us. This is the last place in Canada where anyone should attempt to talk about the wealth of Canada, because you gentlemen come from all parts of the Dominion and know the extent of the wealth of Canada. This is the last place also to talk about the strategic position that Canada occupies in the world of commerce; that also is well known. But this is the proper place to talk about the responsibilities of the people of to-day to those who follow. If we are seriously to go after new people, my feeling is that we should keep that thought strongly before us, so that the offspring of those whom we get will be fit and proper partners for the offspring of the foundation stock of this country.

I have said that we require to spend more money. Five years ago I took up this question of the colonization of Canada and worked out a plan that I thought might be put into operation between the governments of Canada and Great Britain, I circulated it pretty widely, and had many replies. We talk freely about our need for more people, and that thought seems to be in the minds of most of us. Occasionally one would say, "God bless you, I hope you will succeed." There is no cohesion amongst ourselves; there is no sitting around the table and trying to work out something that will be useful to this country in the solution of that problem; no effort made to try to co-ordinate the various interests in the country, except, I presume, in a committee like this. There is as a matter of fact a lot of loose talking about our needing more people. Our failure has been to look the problem squarely in the face and to realize that assets are not got by talking, but by being prepared to pay a reasonable price. This means the financing of settlement and lest this arouse unnecessary concern I may say that I am one of those who believe that the settler always has been financed, at any rate in an indirect way. During the close of the last century and the early part of this century there was a tremendous development of railways in Western Canada. Many of us feel that much of that expansion at that time was unsound and due to unhealthy competition in railway building. However, it put into circulation perhaps half a billion dollars. At that time we threw on the market some of the finest lands in the world, and offered them free. There was a considerable movement of people into the country, and, as I say, there was about half a billion dollars put into circulation. The people of the country as a whole received some benefit from

that. And as this railway construction was largely confined to the newer districts the settlers, to an appreciable extent, received aid in an indirect way.

In the settlement of Ontario there was the building of the Grand Trunk Railway, and other railways, which put into circulation considerable sums of money. Not long ago I had in my possession a letter written at Belleville, Ontario, some seventy years ago. The writer was praying that more money would be put into circulation through the building of navigation canals for the benefit of the settlers. Thus there has been throughout the past century an indirect method of financing new people. It has not been sufficient, perhaps, but it is a fact that we have had that indirect financing of settlement. We have no public works on a large scale to-day, therefore, we are obliged to consider the direct method.

Immediately I discuss financing I am faced with the cry, "That is paternalism". No one who has seen the difficulty under which settlers try to get rooted in the country would charge that assistance to that end was paternalism. To me that is offensive. When one has seen what those settlers have had to face, to suggest that by assisting people in new countries to get rooted is paternalism I think is more or less offensive. They are helping to make this country, and they are an asset to it.

I am aware that some of our settlers are still having their trials and difficulties. One cannot go through the newer part of this country without recognizing that fact.

We have passed, in the way of agriculture, especially in western Canada, more to the idea of mass production, just as the manufacturers have passed to mass production. I am not prepared to say that that condition is permanent, because nothing is permanent.

I have seen the movement from the land to the city. I have seen the Aylmer Road, which leads into the city of Ottawa, forty or fifty years ago when it was a much more attractive piece of country than it is to-day. The homes were more attractive; they were smaller, it is true. I have seen the Alymer Road, probably fall two or three or four hundred per cent in attractiveness, and I have seen this city of Ottawa advance one thousand per cent.

I believe that there is now a movement back to the land, but not of occupying the land as the character that I saw it forty years ago. To-day we have our highways; we have our motors; we have the electrical utilities, and we have the telephone and the radio and I believe that people now living in the cities will find their way out twenty and thirty miles into the country and cultivating small parcels of land. That is the movement that I believe is coming, and I think it would be quite unwise for us to count on a continuance of present day conditions.

The agriculturalist in Western Canada is an exporter. The extent to which we increase our production, to that extent some other country will suffer. But we belong to a family one unit of which is one of the great food consumers of the world—Great Britain. I think a market in Great Britain for our agricultural products is a matter of adjustment. I see no reason why we could not make an arrangement with Great Britain, whereby we will take care of some of her people, by placing them on land so as to get consideration in her market. In these articles that I referred to you will see that I suggest a study of markets for agricultural products, a study of competing countries engaged in agriculture, so that we may deal with this whole subject in an intelligent way, and avoid embarrassing our own citizens engaged in agriculture. That would be the last thing I should have in mind.

So that, I say that we should not be alarmed about the possibilities of increased agricultural production affecting those who are in the country to-day. Changes in conditions are going on all the time.

[Mr. C. A. Magrath.]

Fifty years ago I entered our Western Prairie country, and as an indication of what changes take place in one's lifetime I might refer to my own experience. I was in the employ of a gentleman whom I happen to see in the room at the present time. We were on a survey, and I remember one day when going forward on the trail we saw a cloud of dust ahead of us. Presently it turned out to be a buckboard with two men in it, with about fifteen loose horses. They were coming on the lope, and they pulled out and passed us. The driver was a half-breed, and the other man who was strapped in the buckboard happened to be the Chief Factor of the Hudson Bay Company, in charge of a very large territory in Saskatchewan. The loose animals were for the purpose of changing horses every five or six hours. He was travelling from one Hudson Bay post to another, making on the average about one hundred miles per day. We all thought that it was wonderful, to see a man who was moving from Prince Albert down to Winnipeg in six days. I had a letter from New York three or four days ago from a friend of mine. He said he had been seeing his brother, who flew in from Minneapolis in his own plane with his own pilot, and had flown back to Minneapolis the next day.

The changes which come infinitesimally every day, in a man's lifetime are very great in the aggregate and to undertake to say that Canada is going to be a great exporter of wheat for many years to come is something that cannot be said definitely. Our obligations to those who are engaged in agriculture—our greatest industry, as I see it—are such that colonization and allied questions should be dealt with by close inquiry in an intelligent way.

The position is taken that as existing farmers in the country have received no financing, except in an indirect way, why should newcomers be financed, or, if the immigrants are to be financed, why should not our existing farmers be financed in other ways than under existing conditions to a greater extent than they are. That is a difficult problem. Any assistance we can give to our agriculturists, I endorse as far as it is practical to go. However, I do not think that that is a sound argument, because we might apply it in another way. We might say that because I have been paying taxes in this country for the last forty years, and those who come after get the benefit from those taxes that I should be recompensed in some way.

After all, I believe that citizenship in Canada is a distinction that any new people should appreciate. I believe that this country will respond to every ounce of intelligence that is applied in its administration and in its development. I am not alarmed about Canada not getting people because before long they will come in great numbers. I am concerned with respect to my responsibilities to the future, just as those Fathers of Confederation were concerned at their time in respect to the people of to-day.

We have not yet reached that point in our development that our neighbours reached perhaps forty years ago, when people came to them in vast numbers. Immediately preceding the war they were attracting people at the rate of a million a year. As a matter of fact, their natural increase to-day every six or seven years equals the total population of Canada. The one thing that disturbs my mind is the fact that in the one hundred years ending in 1920, the United States drew from the British Isles over seven million people, according to their statement. They started their system of keeping track of their newcomers in 1820. There are people in Great Britain to-day, where there is a surplus population, who are anxious to meet us and discuss with us the bringing into this country of more of their people. I think if they had shown a proper appreciation of this matter forty or fifty years ago the situation would be much better to-day.

When it comes to new people, if we ask the Dane he will say, "get them from Denmark". They are certainly very excellent people, but they have no

surplus population. That national point of view appeals to all people. If left to me, I suppose I would empty Ireland and Scotland and bring them into this country, but, there again, they have not the surplus people. But there are people to-day that are anxious to deal with us, people in England, where there is a surplus population.

While I have no English blood in me, I recognize what the English have done in the world. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, there is a thousand years of thinking behind the race, and they started on pretty sound lines some seven hundred years ago, when they faced King John and obtained the Magna Charta. There never has been reaping but that there has been sowing, and the reaping from that kind of thinking enabled those people a couple of years ago to settle a national strife in a marvellous fashion; one of the greatest things that has happened in recent times. When we look at people who can get results of that character, and when we realize what they have been doing in the United States, then it seems to me that we should do our utmost to draw people from the British Isles.

As a citizen of Canada, I recognize that we have two foundation stocks; we have the French, and we have the people of the British Isles. My point of view is that they both have certain vested interests in this country, and it is our duty to do what we can to draw from those two races. Unfortunately, France has no surplus stock, but we have the French citizens who have left this country. I do not like to draw the distinction in our country and say French Canadians and English Canadians; we are all one people, we are French speaking and we are English speaking. We have not recognized our obligations to each other as we should, but that is passing, and we are doing so to a greater extent from time to time. So, I say that our first duty is to our own people, and if the people in Canada want to go on the land I would certainly say give them all the assistance that we are prepared to give anyone else.

The more people we can get on the land, the safer the country is, as I see it. Whatever obligations we have to face in our settlement problems should be extended to our own people in our centres of population. We should get all the people we can obtain from Great Britain, and afterwards from other selected countries.

To accomplish that means what? Organization, as I see it. I see the Minister of Immigration here, and I will say in his presence that I believe he and his department can get just as much success as any predecessor, by the system that he has been operating under. But you can only get a certain amount of success within certain limits. I understand your committee has been told that we should not attempt to take the service out of the Government's hands. Personally, I never had any such thought; Parliament is supreme. But I believe there can be built up, under the Government of Canada, an organization that can function with greater independence, and yet be responsive to Parliamentary control.

Personally, if I were engaged in colonization, I would not want to have to send to the Civil Service Commission if I needed a man in British Columbia, for a certain class of work. That would be my business to find the man. I am not criticizing our departmental administration. This, however, is something special, and we have to find men with fertility of mind, because the colonizing of Canada is, I consider, the greatest problem in Canada. It is the greatest national problem, and a most difficult problem, and when we have difficult problems to solve we must enlist the services of men with trained administrative minds.

In this country we have young men who have been very fortunate; young men who have become very wealthy, and who have constructive minds. At present I am thinking of the group of younger financial men, who have undertaken to resuscitate a large industry in the eastern part of this country. I am

not prepared to say that they have gone into that enterprise for the sole purpose of adding dollars onto dollars, but they are of course not overlooking the possible financial reward. Nevertheless they are interested in doing something constructive, and, Mr. Chairman, I do not know anything that is comparable to the constructing of this nation on sound national lines. What I would like to see is the drawing from that source one of these men who has had wide experience in administrative work; a man who has got the habit of signing cheques for large sums of money. Such a man makes the safests kind of a man when it comes to handling money and taking care of the people's taxes.

I am afraid I am dealing with this subject in a disjointed way, much of what I am saying may be seen in another form, in my published articles. I would like to see something created along the lines of the Hydro Commission, which I am not with. I am aware that it is not particularly acceptable to some private interests in this country, but nevertheless, it is there and it is there to stay. What is the situation there? The Premier of the province of Ontario appointed me, but he does not control me. Our commission has to go to the premier and say, "this province needs more power. Our opinion is that it should be developed, or it should be purchased. It will cost a certain amount of money." It is his privilege to say, "No," but once he says, "Yes," and the Legislature votes the money for that particular project, which may cost ten million dollars or more, then it is the business of our Commission to spend the money, having in mind always service to the people. Under those circumstances, an organization of that kind can have but one interest, and one interest alone—the interest of the people. As I see it, that principle can be applied to this question of colonization.

It would not be a question alone of looking for people, it would be a question of looking into the kindred subjects: agriculture, agricultural markets, and competitors in agriculture. The allied questions are almost of as great importance as the main question. When you get a man on that basis, when you get him free more or less from political control, he begins to see the light. Never start a man in any big business unless he can become enthusiastic over it. If you can get your Department of Immigration to be enthusiastic over its work, it is an indication that its officers are being allowed the freedom that they feel that they should have. I have not followed the activities of the Immigration Department for some years, because I have had other things to do, but I am confident that they are doing the best they can under the circumstances.

If I had the say, I would select one of these outstanding younger financial men. Many people in the country rather hesitate when you talk about the financial men of the country. I have nothing in common with them; my activities are entirely apart from them. I came out of the west where feeling was more or less against them. If it ever should come that I should have to say, "East or West," I should say "West," because my younger years were spent there, and it is where the making of Canada will largely be. I have seen enough of those men to justify me in saying that they will respond if you throw responsibility on them. I am not afraid of that type of man in Canada at all. We need those men, and they are doing a good work for this country. The same applies to our railways. We may be critical, but as long as there is criticism there is evidence of desire to advance. People who do not criticize will disappear.

I would select one of our younger generation of leading financial men and I would ask him to look into this whole problem, to consider fully all the views that are placed before you here and such other views as he could get, and come back to you at the next session of Parliament and tell you what he thinks should be done. I think that that would be a real start. No man could possibly be engaged in colonizing Canada and not become enthusiastic, if he has a proper appreciation of the problem. If he has that appreciation for the future of this country, I say that that man will play up, whether you draw

him from financial service or elsewhere. The advantage of drawing from financial service is the business education, if I may so express it, that he has obtained, and his courage to attack big problems. These men are tackling big things—they are making money out of it it is true—but they are accomplishing something.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: It is a great pleasure for me to be here, because I have never been able to get even half a dozen to sit around a table and exchange ideas in this matter. We become dogmatic; we all know the right way. As I see it, the chief difficulty is to lay down a plan. Men who are worth anything will develop their own plan. You cannot work out a cut and dried method of procedure and put it in the hands, say, of the farmer. He says, "I am doing this job, and I am the one that is going to run this job. I appreciate your views with respect to agriculture, but I am in this business. When you come to talk about agriculture I want my views to be considered." One of our difficulties, as I see it, is in laying out a cut and dry method. People who have the habit of doing things are not controlled in that way.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Mr. Magrath, I do not just understand whether your remarks were indirectly suggesting that money should be spent to assist in the securing and establishing of foreign people—we are designating them as foreign because they are all coming into Canada—in a much larger way than we are doing to-day?—A. In the articles that I have referred to I have touched upon that subject, Mr. Stewart. What I have in mind is this: people do not move to a new country and become pioneers if they have means. It is the people with an adventurous spirit, and largely without means, who do the pioneering. If we had the organization, of the character that I have in mind, we would have to buy lands, or we would have to improve lands, because free land only applies to the western territories. No man should talk about the colonization of Canada without thinking of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, or British Columbia; they are all a part of Canada, and we should be interested in their colonization just as much as in the colonization of these western lands. Somebody has to produce the money in order to acquire these lands, or, if they are far removed from the railways, to improve the lands. My view is that an organization, of the type I referred to, would do exactly what we are doing in the Hydro. I would call upon the Premier of Nova Scotia, and say, "Have you any lands suitable for people to make a living on?" I am not going to find out; I am going to make him find out. I would oblige him to come forward with what he has to offer. I would call upon him to give me evidence as to the suitability of those lands for agriculture, the conditions surrounding them, and so on, so that, in seeking people as complete a knowledge as possible of conditions they would have to contend with. You would have to buy those lands once my suggested organization had passed upon their suitability for settlement. Once they passed upon it, my idea is that I would submit that, as we have to in Ontario, to the Premier, or the Minister of Immigration, and he would turn loose upon that his technical men and advisers. If they said it looked all right, well and good; if they should say that it was not sufficiently attractive to lend the credit of this country on, he would turn it down. But once they satisfied themselves that it was a fairly reasonable proposition, then my idea is that that organization would have the right to issue land settlement bonds, not exceeding the amount mentioned in the specifications of that project. In bringing that project forward, the Premier of Nova Scotia, would submit to the central organization a certain area of land; how it was to be acquired; what it would probably cost, and this information would be in the shape of a report. Once the Minister of Immigration passed upon that, that would be the authority

[Mr. C. A. Magrath.]

of the colonization organization to issue land settlement bonds to an amount not exceeding what their own officials believed to be sufficient to carry on that work, and believed to be sufficient in the interests of Canada, to protect the Canadian taxpayers. Then the organization having the authority to issue these land settlement bonds, would set about finding people for those lands. As those lands were handed over to settlers they would take mortgages from the settlers, on the easiest possible terms, as security for the Government in connection with its expenditures. There would be a certain amount of incidental expenses, of which I would expect the province to take a share. The first thing this organization would do would be to bring about co-operation between the provinces of Canada. I say here, without fear of contradiction, that we have never had co-operation between our different provinces in connection with colonization. It is the greatest problem that we have to deal with, and we have never been able to get co-operation among them, and that is the one thing we have got to bring about.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. The New Brunswick Government is undertaking to provide five hundred farms at the present time that we are trying to settle. With the little experience I have had, I am afraid it would need some of those big financial men to do that. In immigration you know you are dealing with humanity; it is not a business that you can control, because one half of the problem is the people you are dealing with. You are going to have a very big percentage of failures; there is no question about it. You have got to keep that in mind. With the people who settled in the west there was a big percentage of failures, and we all know that?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. A lot of these things have got to be taken into consideration. We have got to consider the kind of people we can get on the land, after you have spent millions of dollars, and what the failures will amount to. I do not want to throw any cold water on your suggestion.—A. I quite appreciate what you say. My answer to that is that I only consider failures when I am forced to. In thinking of any big, constructive piece of work, I would never approach it on the basis of expecting failures. I know there will likely be failures, but that is my answer to that. I said a while ago that this is not the place to talk about what Canada is. My judgment is that there is no other Canada in the world to-day. It offers such opportunities for people that want to become good citizens, and the problem presents a very large vision. There will be losses. Supposing we lend the credit of this country to the extent of \$100,000,000 in settling people? Supposing we lose twenty per cent? We would have \$80,000,000 producing new gold dollars every year, and it would take care of the twenty per cent loss. That is the way it appeals to me. I appreciate the Minister's difficulty, and, as I say, it is a great problem, and it calls for a great deal of courage. The Minister always has his hand on the throttle, because if the organization that I have in mind comes forward with a plan for settling lands in New Brunswick, and it is not working out successfully, when that organization come forward with a second plan for the settlement of lands say in British Columbia, the Minister will say, "I cannot get behind this unless you gentlemen make your New Brunswick project a success; we cannot continue to lend the credit of this country unless we are getting returns."

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. In your opinion, any scheme for putting people on the land cannot be worked out without complete co-operation of the provinces?—A. I think it is very desirable.

Q. I agree thoroughly with you. I just want to say that in every attempt that I have made in this direction, and I have made many, the feeling is that

[Mr. C. A. Magrath.]

this is a responsibility of the Federal Government, and I am very glad that you say that to this Committee, because we will be discussing that very problem when we bring in our report. There is an impression in the minds of a great many people that abandoned farms should be taken into consideration. I do not agree with that, but where there are new lands to be developed I think your suggestion is a sound one. I have never agreed with the idea of putting someone on an abandoned farm where someone else could not live. I think the chances are all in favour of failure in those cases.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. If such an organization as you suggest were set up, and put under the leadership of very able men, would not one of the first problems be to determine the result of increased production to the farmers who are already here?—

A. Yes. I think that anyone engaged in that work, will, of necessity, delve into all these allied problems.

Q. And should one of their first duties be to inquire, so far as it is possible, into the result of the immigration that we have had in the last, say, a certain period of years?—A. Well, it would depend, Mr. Coote, on what they are after. You mean for the purpose of drawing from that information something that will be valuable to them in the conduct of their work?

Q. Yes.—A. Yes. And not for the purpose of criticizing something that has been done in the past? I do not imagine that that is what you had in mind at all?

Q. No, not at all. The main idea is that the first work that is necessary in Canada, if we are to have something constructive, is a study of the results which have been achieved. From that we might get a proper basis on which conduct our immigration efforts in the future?—A. I quite agree with that.

Q. That was the idea you had in mind in suggesting this organization?—A. I quite agree with that idea.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. In the eastern provinces, where the farms are small, I notice the tendency, during the last fifteen years, has been for some farmers to move west or south. In the days of railway construction many of them went west to work on the railways, and then settled, and are now fathers of families and grandfathers of families. Would you not include within the sphere of operations of such an organization the transplanting of young men and women from the east, who insist upon removal, into the western territory, rather than to the south and entering into industrial employment there?—A. Yes. I thought I had made that clear, that anything that we are prepared to do for people who are not new residents of Canada, we should be prepared to do for our own people. If, in this city of Ottawa, there are young men who feel that they would like to go in for agriculture, why not help them to go into that calling? It will mean that there will be vacancies caused here, and those positions will be filled from elsewhere, but I would certainly give to our own people the same privileges we give to others, and the same assistance.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Would you extend the system to men in western Canada who were living in the towns and cities?—A. Yes, I do not see any reason why we should not do so. I can go back to the time when it was said that the agriculturalist held the safest position in the country. There is always a living to be had on the land. Under the mass production idea I do not know what is going to happen, but if we get the people on the land they can always make a living.

[Mr. C. A. Magrath.]

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Would you mind giving your opinion—perhaps you have done so before I came in—as to the wisdom of following the course which has been accepted by all parties in Canada for a number of years, of directing our activities in immigration to those immigrants who would go on the land, and practically excluding the immigrant who would engage in other occupations? Is there any tendency in that to overbalance things, from the standpoint of production, or is it advisable to confine our activities to bringing immigrants in here who will go on the land, and keeping out those who would engage in other occupations? From the standpoint of the farmer, it seems to me that it would be better for him to have others come in to whom he could sell his products. There is no lack or dearth of production on the farm; there is over-production, and, in that respect, we are inviting men to come in to compete with the farmer in what he produces. It seems to me that that is a little bit illogical?—A. Well, so far as carrying on the manufacturing activities of the country are concerned, I do not think—I speak without very much knowledge—that there is any trouble in getting people for the industries within our centres. I imagine that is the opinion of those engaged in the work, but it has never occurred to me that Canada would have any trouble in finding people to meet the needs of those engaged in the manufacturing industry. If we go in for a large land settlement policy, as the Minister mentioned a moment ago, there will be a considerable proportion that will not remain on the land, and who will go back to the city. In any thought that I have given to colonization, I have only dealt with land settlement and have not looked at the other side of the problem at all.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Have we any assurance from these foreign markets that they would consume an increased exportation by the western farmer?—A. I do not think that we can forecast the future at all in that respect. I did say that I felt in the conduct of the work, it would be the duty of the colonization organization to delve into that very problem. I heard a statement a few years ago by a man, who I believe understood what he was talking about, that in central Europe, and extending up into Russia, they have got more wheat farming land than we have on this Continent. The main consumer of agricultural products is a member of our own family of nations. I should imagine, as they have people to spare and want to place them in this country, that we ought to be able to work out some policy with them whereby we would at least retain their markets, if there were competitors for that market from outside foreign nations.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Mr. Beatty, the President of the C.P.R., when he was giving his evidence the other day, suggested that the organization, such as you speak of, should be a one man organization. He admitted that he was a prejudiced witness, so far as one man organizations were concerned. What would be your opinion with regard to a one man organization handling this proposition?—A. The responsibilities usually fall back on the one man; he usually has to take all the responsibility, and therefore, I would favour the one man organization.

Q. Would that man be subject to the jurisdiction of the Minister of Immigration, or would he be the Deputy Minister of Immigration?—A. No. My thought is that that man would be independent, within the limits of the money he has to expend for a specific work, which the Minister has authorized.

Q. He would not be the Deputy Minister of Immigration?—A. Not in the plan I have in mind.

[Mr. C. A. Magrath.]

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. He would have a free hand?—A. In the work I am engaged in, in the province of Ontario, we conduct that work without interference. There is the thought, especially in the United States, that we are politically controlled. The Premier of Ontario has never suggested to me where we should buy a box of matches. We get the authority to spend certain money for certain specific work, and we spend that money to carry out that project, and we are not interfered with at all. I have dealt with premiers of different political faith, and I have never had any difficulties of that character. I have been allowed to carry on my own work in my own way, having due regard to the fact that the people are supreme in their Legislature. I do not think the man who has that point of view will go very far astray in spending the people's taxes.

Q. So far as your evidence is concerned, in your opinion, any scheme for immigration into Canada must necessarily be, and is inseparably linked with the assimilation of those immigrants; is that correct?—A. Yes.

Q. Any scheme you are dealing with now refers only to agriculture?—A. That is all.

Q. And not to industrial work at all?—A. I have kept that out.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. I had access some time ago to some reports made in respect to the Australian colonization scheme. I found, in the development of colonization, the Commission, which is there appointed to take charge, found it absolutely necessary, for the success of their work, to consider, as a department of that work, the development of the natural resources within the limits of the territory in which land settlement was being carried on. They found that the sons and daughters of the settlers coming on the land would not always adhere to the same occupation. They found it absolutely necessary for the maintenance of population to consider the other natural resources in that vicinity, so that that development might take place correlatively or subsidiary to the land settlement. Has that phase of it been brought to your attention?—A. No, Mr. Cahan, it has not, and if it had I would not feel competent to discuss it. I go on the assumption that we are dealing with a problem that has entirely new phases, and that it will expand. I remember the time when Mr. Eddy was whittling matches. If he had been asked at that particular time as to what it was going to expand into, he could not have said. These things expand with time, and if it is necessary to expand along the lines that you are suggesting, Mr. Cahan, that is something that would be done through the instrumentality of the men engaged in the work.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. In your opinion, would the success of this man in charge of immigration, whether it is the Minister or a Commissioner, be judged by the number of immigrants he brings in each year?—A. No; certainly not.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Mr. Magrath on behalf of the Committee for coming here and giving us the benefit of his advice. Thank you, Mr. Magrath.

Witness retired.

JOHN S. DENNIS called and sworn.

The WITNESS: Gentlemen, I have been asked in the first place to state my position and association with colonization and development. My present position is that of Chief Commissioner of Colonization and Development of the Canadian Pacific Railway service, and perhaps I might, like the last speaker,

[Mr. S. J. Dennis.]

preface my remarks by saying that I believe I am justified in speaking on this subject of immigration and colonization due to the fact that I have been engaged in it to a greater or lesser extent for something over fifty years.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: In presenting the following general statement regarding the subject of immigration and colonization, I desire to preface my remarks by stating that the information I am putting before the Committee is not submitted in a spirit of adverse criticism of the policies and regulations of the Department of Immigration and Colonization but in the hope that the information I may be able to present will be of some assistance to the Committee in dealing with the important question which you have under consideration.

Having spent the greater portion of my life in more or less intimate connection with the subject of immigration, colonization and development, I recognize possibly more fully than the ordinary individual the many sided nature of the problem, the many diverse views as to the policy and regulations which should be adopted for its solution, and the difficulties with which the Department is confronted in dealing with these matters.

Any references later on to the existing regulations effecting the movement of British colonists are based on a careful study of the application of these regulations in Great Britain and are offered in the hope that they may be of use in assisting to make those regulations more effective and in reaching the end for which they were no doubt framed, namely, the expediting of a more rapid and continuous flow of British colonists to Canada.

The facts with reference to the activities of the Department of Colonization and Development of the Canadian Pacific service have been very fully presented to the Committee by the evidence given by Mr. Beatty, President of the Company, and Mr. Macalister, Assistant Commissioner of the Department of Colonization and Development. It is, therefore, not necessary for me to again refer to that phase of the Company's work in attempting to further the immigration of desirable colonists to Canada, but as I have just returned from a four months' trip to Great Britain and the Central and Northern European countries from which colonists are being recruited by the Canadian Pacific organization, with the permission of the Committee I would propose to put before them certain facts affecting the movement of colonists from Great Britain and Europe as part of the general campaign which is being carried on in the effort to increase the movement of desirable colonists from these countries to Canada.

For convenience of reference I would deal first with the movement of so called Continental colonists, out-lining as briefly as possible the conditions existing there as I ascertained them from a personal inspection in practically all these countries during my late visit.

Generally speaking, it can be stated that there is a marked desire on the part of many people in all these central and northern European countries to emigrate, and due to the fact that in practically all of them a large proportion of the population are engaged in agricultural pursuits it is possible to obtain, with a careful method of selection, large numbers of colonists who are prepared to come to Canada to engage in agriculture or agricultural employment, this number being proportional, of course, to the conditions existing as to over population in certain of the countries in question.

At the present time there are practically no difficulties put in the way by the Governments of the different Central and Northern European countries to the emigration of their nationals. In some of these countries definite regulations have been put in force governing the recruitment and acceptance of the colonists, and in others, like Holland, the Governments are now financially assisting their nationals to emigrate, and similar proposals for assistance are being considered in other of the Scandinavian countries.

[Mr. J. S. Dennis.]

The division of the Continental countries in the Preferred and Non-preferred zones has been fully explained to the Committee by others who have given evidence, and full explanation has also been given as to the conditions under which the colonists from non-preferred countries are recruited under the agreement as between the Department of Immigration and Colonization and the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways Departments of Colonization and Development.

I also understand, although I have not seen the evidence, that the facts relative to the civil and medical examination of colonists from both preferred and non-preferred countries have been put before the Committee, and I assume, therefore, that it is not necessary that I should deal in detail with these subjects other than to express the opinion that the present system of the physical and medical examination of Continental colonists from both preferred and non-preferred countries at the port of embarkation is working satisfactorily.

In view of the many statements which have been made that a larger percentage of the immigration into Canada should be from Great Britain, and with reference to certain criticisms which have arisen regarding the present medical and civil examinations affecting the movement of British colonists, I respectfully submit for the information of the Committee certain foundation facts affecting the movement of British colonists ascertained by me in England, Scotland and Northern Ireland during my late trip.

In the first place it must be clearly understood that so long as we are not in a position in Canada to invite any large immigration, except of the agricultural or agricultural labouring class, the possibility of obtaining any large number of that class from Great Britain is very limited. Great Britain is essentially an industrial country, with a comparatively small percentage of the population engaged in agricultural employment, and the supply of the class that we are justified in encouraging to emigrate is consequently very small.

I note it has been stated before this Committee that the Canadian Pacific is more interested in the immigration of Continentals than those from the British Isles, but the facts with regard to the efforts made through our Department of Colonization and Development, and our expenditures in endeavouring to encourage and stimulate British colonization, have been put before the Committee by previous witnesses. I would like, however, to place before the Committee the following statement of the actual emigrants moved to Canada during 1927 under the auspices of the Department of Colonization and Development of the Canadian Pacific Railway in refutation of the statement referred to, and as indicating the marked and insistent efforts which are being made by that Department to further stimulate British colonization:—

STATEMENT showing Immigrants brought to Canada under the auspices of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the British Isles and Europe during the year 1927.

	Males	Females	Children	Total Souls
From British Isles	13,355	8,514	4,237	26,106
From so-called Preferred Countries, which I presume the Committee know comprise the northern European countries including Germany	6,994	3,096	1,433	11,523
From so-called Non-Preferred countries, the central European countries	15,024	2,584	1,378	18,986
Total				<u>56,615</u>

In dealing with the specific question of the effect of the Dominion Government regulations on the movement of British colonists, and based upon the detailed information which I was able to obtain, I submit the following, and for convenience have divided the question under the headings of "Medical Examination" and "Civil Examination".

[Mr. J. S. Dennis.]

MEDICAL EXAMINATION

I am in entire sympathy and accord with the enactment and enforcement of any regulations which will ensure that colonists of any nationality brought to Canada must be both physically and mentally fit, but it would seem clear from my investigation that the effort to reach that end through the substitution of a small corps of Canadian doctors for the large corps of British Roster doctors previously employed in passing colonists mentally and physically, has not been up to date a complete success.

Prior to the enactment of these regulations the medical examination of intending emigrants was conducted by the roster of local doctors with little or no inconvenience to the prospective colonist, outside of the payment of a fee of \$2.50, which was subsequently done away with, and the larger number of the roster doctors enabled prospective colonists to undergo the medical examination without going any long distance, and with the utmost privacy.

The regulation requiring all colonists, whether coming to Canada under Assisted Passage or paying their full fare, to appear before one or other of the small corps of Canadian doctors in public places, and at inconvenience to themselves, and, in the case of the labouring class the possible loss of work, has not in my opinion been conducive to an additional movement of colonists from Great Britain.

In Scotland and Ireland, and to a certain extent in England, there is a marked disinclination on the part of the people to publicity as to their intention to emigrate. Under the system of inspection by a roster doctor who, in many cases, was the local doctor in the district from which the colonists proposed to move, the medical inspection could take place without any publicity in the evening or at off periods, whereas under the present system all colonists are called upon to appear publicly for medical examination, and in the case of medical and physical rejection they return to their homes embittered against Canada owing to the local publicity relative to their disability.

I understand it has been claimed that the substitution of the Canadian corps of doctors for the roster doctors required a system for final medical and physical examination before the colonist came forward to Canada. This is hardly the case, because the British Government have never surrendered their right to have intending colonists embarking at any British Port passed upon by the Board of Trade doctor, nor have the steamship companies, as far as I know, surrendered the right to reject a colonist for physical and mental reasons where they were satisfied they would have to return them to the country of their origin and possibly subject that company to a fine.

The further fact that the Canadian medical examination is not a final one is proved by the instances which have arisen in connection with colonists recruited by my Department in Great Britain, who have come forward to the port of embarkation holding physical and mental certificates of fitness from a Canadian corps of doctors and who have been rejected and refused permission to embark by the Board of Trade doctors.

There have been further instances of objections on the part of British colonists who are not asking for assisted passage being required to subject themselves and their families to medical inspection by unknown Canadian doctors in public places, but this, I understand, is being overcome as far as possible by providing for special medical examinations, and also that in certain districts the medical staff is being added to by the authorizing of certain of the old roster doctors to perform medical and physical examinations.

CIVIL EXAMINATIONS

The facts above quoted as to the objections of colonists in Great Britain to publicity as to their intention to emigrate also apply in equal force to the

matter of civil examination. Under the present regulations the colonist is required, after he has been recruited by my Department or any of the other organizations in Great Britain engaged in encouraging British emigration, to fill out certain forms and give certain references. I understand that these forms of application and forms of reference have already been put before the Committee.

At the same time he is required to obtain a photograph to attach to his card preliminary to his medical examination.

His references are first communicated with by the recruiting agency, and if satisfactory, together with his forms of application, are then forwarded to one of the ten officers of the Dominion Department of Immigration and Colonization, and the prospective colonist is subsequently advised from that office as to the place and date of his civil examination, and also to the subsequent place and date for his medical examination, unless it is possible in the first instance to hold both examinations simultaneously. This procedure results in the centralization in a limited number of offices of the applications and forms of references of the colonists recruited by any of the large number of organizations concerned in the recruiting of British colonists and in a limited number of department offices with the consequent congestion and delay.

It also involves the undesirable publicity feature already referred to, special trips in some cases having to be made to obtain a photograph, loss of time on the part of men at present in employment to enable them to attend at a specific place and date, and as far as my Department is concerned has finally resulted in the loss of a large percentage of men whom we have been put to the expense of visiting and recruiting who, when notified by the Dominion Government Agent to attend at a specific point, have failed to turn up.

Without any desire to be specially critical, or to offer destructive criticism, I have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion the present regulations relative to both medical and civil examination of British colonists require careful revision, amendment and explanation so as to overcome some of the difficulties above referred to, and to remove as far as possible the delays which are now consequent upon a cumbersome and red-tape system. I offer as a constructive suggestion toward that end, that the reputable organizations concerned in recruiting British colonists be given the right to recruit and accept such colonists as to their occupational qualifications, and entitle them to come forward to Canada subject to an examination as to mental and physical fitness by a carefully selected roster of British doctors, acting under the superintendence of a small corps of Canadian doctors.

In conclusion, and as having a further bearing on the statement above referred to that the Canadian Pacific Company is more interested in the movement of Continental than British colonists, I desire to read to the Committee the following two letters sent to the Press by Bishop Lloyd of Prince Albert and the replies that have been addressed to him, and also handed to the Press.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until 4 p.m.

The Committee resumed at 4 o'clock, p.m.

JOHN S. DENNIS recalled.

The CHAIRMAN: When we adjourned at one o'clock Colonel Dennis was on the stand, if I may use that expression, and Dr. Edwards had the floor.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. This morning, Colonel Dennis, you went into considerable detail in regard to the procedure respecting the civil and medical examinations of immi-

grants in the old country, with some observations in regard thereto. Would you be kind enough to give the procedure with continental immigrants as to civil and medical examinations, and any observations you have to offer on that?—A. Well, as the Committee knows, the continent is divided into two zones, preferred and non-preferred countries. The preferred countries are France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Switzerland and Germany, and the procedure with regard to civil and medical examinations for colonists from these preferred countries is that the colonist of any class who desires to come to Canada obtains a passport. He goes to the port of embarkation and there he fills out an interrogatory form, certain questions which are required by the department with regard to his nationality and so on. He undergoes a medical and civil examination there, the civil examination on the basis of his interrogatory form, the medical examination by the port doctor. If passed by both he embarks.

In the non-preferred countries the condition is somewhat different. As the Committee have already been informed, under the provisions of the agreement as between the Department of Immigration and Colonization and the Colonization Departments of the Canadian Pacific and of the Canadian National Railways, in the non-preferred countries which include Latvia, Esthonia, Poland, Jugo-Slovakia, Austria-Hungary and Roumania, the recruiting of colonists is restricted to agriculturalists and agricultural labourers. They are recruited by the representatives of the two companies, and in those countries the two companies have officials who are designated as certificate issuing officers, who are supposed to speak the language of the country and who have gone from Canada with a knowledge of farming conditions, so that by an examination they can satisfy themselves that the applicant is of the class, agriculturist, agricultural labourer or domestic, whom we are authorized to bring forward under our agreement. If the officer is satisfied he gives the applicant what is called an occupational certificate, upon which his photograph is endorsed, and contains the certificate in the language of the national that he is coming to Canada for the purpose of engaging in agriculture or agricultural labour. This he signs. He takes that and goes forward to the port of embarkation. He presents that certificate with his passport to the representative of the Dominion Department of Immigration and Colonization who, by examination, satisfies himself as to whether or not the applicant is entitled to the occupational certificate. If he is so satisfied he passes him, and the colonist undergoes the medical examination at the port, and if passed, embarks for Canada.

Q. Is that medical examination by a Canadian doctor?—A. The medical examination now at the ports is by a Canadian doctor. I should have stated that in the preferred and non-preferred countries—speaking of my own company—we have our own medical officers who pass upon the colonist before we encourage him to come forward to the port. We do that for our own protection because, of course, if we send men forward to the port who are not passed by the Dominion doctors there, we are at the expense of taking them home again.

Q. Is there less inconvenience and delay on the part of the continental immigrant passing his medical and civil examinations before embarkation, than there is in the case of the immigrants from the British Isles?—A. Yes—in my opinion.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. That requires some explanation, Colonel Dennis. A man from Jugo-Slovakia coming down to the port takes his chances that he may not be passed?—A. Yes. I made that clear, that if he comes to the port and is not passed there, he has to go home.

[Mr. J. S. Dennis.]

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Colonel Dennis, I took it from your remarks this morning that the particular reason why we are not getting British immigrants which we should be getting is in respect to the regulations. Do you think that is so?—A. I do.

Q. As a great colonization body—either of the transportation companies being great colonizers—were you or any members of your organization now engaged in the recruiting of British colonists asked to express an opinion regarding the regulation or regulations before they were put into force; that is, when the department issues a new regulation is there any co-operation between the bodies interested in immigration? Are you asked for your opinion as to the regulations, or does the department simply create the regulations and just hand them to you without any consideration on your part?—A. As regards the existing regulations, myself or any member of the department were not consulted with regard to that, before they were promulgated. Our first notice of them was in the official receipt of them after they had been put in force by the department.

Q. So that your company would not assume any of the responsibility for the present regulation that is in force in Great Britain?—A. No.

Q. You would not assume that?—A. No.

Q. I thought after listening to you this morning, that you could not have been consulted, or you would not have been as pronounced in your statement about the examination.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Colonel Dennis, you gave some figures of immigration in 1927. Have you any figures of the immigration for the year 1928?—A. No, I have not, except the figures to show that as far as the movement by my Department is concerned, it is about 40 per cent less than for the same period last year.

Q. How about the movement from Europe?—A. I think the movement from Europe up to date is about the same. I have not the exact figures. We can provide the Committee with those exact figures as far as my Department is concerned.

Q. It might be interesting to know that. You spoke this morning regarding commissions that were paid. That is the nominations from this side for immigrants from the continent. You said the commission was based on the amount that was paid on passage money, five per cent, which amounted to about \$5 for continental immigrants, and \$2.50 for British immigrants?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, I presume you know quite a lot regarding these nominations in the course of your business?—A. I do, yes. Too much, in fact.

Q. Do you know the workings of your different Associations throughout the country?—A. Yes.

Q. Are these men appointed in the Associations by you, or by the local community?—A. We are dealing with different classes of associations. We have a group of what we call major associations: the Lutheran Immigrant Board; the German Catholic Board, the British Immigration and Colonization Association; the Scottish Immigrant Aid Association, and others of that class which are practically all operating under Federal charters of incorporation.

Q. I am speaking, Colonel, of the associations which you form in districts throughout the provinces, and more particularly in Manitoba?—A. Yes, well, the other class is what we call Local Colonization Boards. The Local Colonization Boards are organized by the association of a certain group of people in a district for the purpose of assisting in the development of their district by receiving and placing colonists that are brought forward. They are purely a voluntary organization. We have nothing to do with the appointment of their officers; they elect their own officers.

Q. But you give the Secretary of that Association, privilege, do you not?—A. We give the Secretary, or the President, whichever one is nominated by the Association as the active member to carry on the work—we give him local transportation on our lines for the district covered in their activities, and then we pay them a dollar for each colonist that they locate in their district.

Q. Have you found in your experience a good many instances of nominations and undesirables from the continent?—A. Not under the present regulations. Up to this year, the system of nominations was very faulty, and we did find very many fake nominations. I use the word designedly; but under the system now in force, we have been able to obviate that, because the present system of nominations is this: if you desire to nominate somebody for farm employment, you fill out the proper form, and you must make an affidavit on that form as to the truth of your statement; the fact that you are on the farm referred to; and on the form you show where your farm is, what it is, what facilities you have for the employment, and then, attached to that must be a statement by the nearest bank manager or the Justice of the Peace that they know you, that they know you are on that farm, and that, in their opinion, you are qualified to employ the person that you nominate. We have found that that system has obviated a great deal of the trouble that previously existed, where nominations were made by men who had no intention of employing those that they nominated.

Q. How long have these regulations been in force?—A. That is not a regulation; not in regard to nominations.

Q. The reason I ask you, Colonel, is that I received a letter yesterday from one of my constituents who is a police magistrate in a village near where I live, who says that during the past winter he was asked as magistrate to sign nomination papers, on account of the fact that there is no bank manager there, and he says that in a number of cases he refused to sign.—A. I am glad to hear that.

Q. Because the persons who were nominated were not in his opinion, of good character; but, after refusing to sign, he finds that these nomination papers have been signed by somebody else, and that when the immigrant comes into the country, he goes to the man whom he, the magistrate, refused to sign a nomination paper for?—A. I can only answer that by saying that all these nominations come to Montreal, to the headquarters of my Department. They are there handled by a special official, and in any case where a nomination comes forward that is not complete, in the sense that the information on the form is not complete, that the affidavit is not complete, and that it is not accompanied by the signed statement of the bank manager, or Justice of the Peace, it is refused. I would be very much surprised if any of the nominations he may refer to, have been dealt with by us. I would be very surprised.

Q. He says, that last winter he received a number of them. I would like to point this out, as a matter of general talk throughout the province of Manitoba, that a great many of those associations are not concerned about who they bring in, so long as they get that fee?—A. Frankly, I must say that that has not been our experience. We conceived the idea of the creation of these local colonization boards three or four years ago, with the definite object of getting the people in a certain locality interested in the development of their district. After some very careful investigation, we prepared a series of figures to show to the merchants in any village what it would mean to them to have an additional family located in the district tributary to their village as a marketing centre. Using the statistics issued by the Department, we were able to show that a family of five, located in a district meant an annual budget for what they did not produce, of clothing, boots, implements, groceries and so on, of \$1,516 a year, so we naturally were able to say to these people: "Now if you

will create a small organization here, and first make a survey of your district and find out what opportunities there are for the placement of single farm labourers, domestics, or families, and then will undertake to place them, and will give us a signed order for them, stating the character of family you want, the nationality of the family, and when you want them, the date for delivery, we will undertake their recruitment without cost to you, and their delivery to you for placement, and on proof of your having placed them, we will pay you this fee. I would like to add, that I have no hesitation in saying that we have received very valuable assistance from these local colonization boards in developing the districts tributary to their centres.

Q. I am very glad indeed, Colonel, to hear you say you are tightening up the restrictions on these local committees, and would amend that still further, that you should carefully scrutinize these nominations because I think they have been abused. I have one or two questions along another line. You were speaking this morning of medical inspection in the old country. Have you any objection personally to an examination taking place of the immigrant in the port of embarkation, rather than in the country?—A. None whatever.

Q. Would you not consider that that was the proper place for the inspection to take place?—A. Well, it would involve certain disabilities over and above those that are now suffered, because the immigrant would have to go longer distances. The only ports of embarkation are Southampton, Liverpool, Belfast and Glasgow. No immigrants are embarked at London. So that, you see, all the colonists, say from the North of Ireland, would have to go long distances to Belfast. Those in the North and middle part of England would have to go to Liverpool. Those in the central and Southern part to Southampton. Practically from the whole of Scotland, they would have to go to Glasgow. That would involve long distances, and very considerable expense.

Q. Would that be a feasible proposition in your estimation?—A. It would be feasible, yes.

Q. Would it be a practical and expeditious way?—A. It would be practical, but would not be as good a system as I think might be established.

Q. Would it be any better than the system now established, with a number of doctors in different places, and also the roster doctors?—A. No.

Q. It would not be as good as that?—A. No.

Q. You would say that the system of having a number of medical men appointed along with the roster doctors is better than having the colonist examined at the port of embarkation?—A. I think the system that existed—

Q. Excuse me, Colonel, if you would not mind answering my question first. Would you say that the system now where they have Canadian doctors appointed, along with some roster doctors, is better than having them examined at the port of embarkation?—A. Yes, but it does not go far enough.

Q. Do you know of the practice, and procedure of the United States now?—A. The practice of the United States, yes.

Q. Is it that the consuls are now having immigrants examined at the port of embarkation instead of having them examined in the different localities?—A. Not altogether. A great many immigrants are medically examined at the consulate, which may not be at the port of embarkation.

Q. How many places have Consuls in the old country?—A. That, I cannot answer. I do not think in Great Britain, speaking quite at random, they have more than half a dozen. I have no figures for that.

Q. I think that is correct; about half a dozen. Now, the United States are proposing to have medical inspection in the Old Country at their consulates, of which there are about half a dozen?—A. In Great Britain, yes.

Q. Under that system, I presume, it is intended to get away from the detention period at Ellis Island where all the trouble arose?—A. Yes.

Q. Then, according to your evidence, what we are now doing, with our doctors, is better than the system that is being established by the United States?—A. In Great Britain it affords better facilities for the medical examination of colonists than that of the United States. I am of that opinion.

Q. Now, Colonel, you spoke with regard to the system that was in force before the appointment of these Canadian doctors. How long has this been in vogue?—A. The system of examination of immigrants in Great Britain by roster doctors I think, has been in force practically ever since the war.

Q. You mentioned, or some witness mentioned as to immigrants from England and Scotland, that the reason why they did not come was because of the publicity given to the fact of the inspection?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you seriously say that?—A. I beg your pardon?

Q. Do you seriously say that, I mean with knowledge of the facts?—A. Absolutely.

Q. Have any complaints been made to you about that?—A. We have had, I will not say very many, but we have had many cases where people refused to attend at the central point for civil and medical examination, on account of the fact that it was made public to the whole district that they contemplated emigrating to Canada.

Q. They have changed their opinions since I left the Old Country; there was no false modesty then about people emigrating to Canada?—A. How long have you been here?

Q. Seventeen years?—A. I am quite sure that if you had been there since the War you would have found, as we have found, and all other organizations interested in recruiting, a marked disinclination on the part of people to publicity relative to the fact that the contemplated emigrating.

Q. I quite accept your statement. The reason I am asking you is this, how would you propose to get over that modesty?—A. I would propose a return, as I have it in mind, to somewhat the same system as was followed before these regulations came into force. Perhaps I can illustrate it by taking our own case; we were given a quota by the Department of Immigration and Colonization of British families, British farm labourers; we employed our men to recruit them. One of our agents would say, I will come to you in the district in which you live, having got in touch with you since you thought over our advertising or attended our lectures, or having got an idea that you were emigrating; we would discuss the whole subject with him, sit down with him, fill out the forms of application and his references. Now, we would look at the list; here is the nearest Roster Doctor, you may know him or he may be a few miles away, it is your business to go to that Roster Doctor and get this medical form filled out. He could go in the evening or possibly on a Sunday, or on a Saturday afternoon; he could go during a period when he was not employed. The fact that he went to see the Roster Doctor invited no publicity at all. It was the local doctor, and people were going in and out of his surgery all the time. He would go to the Roster Doctor, and if the Roster Doctor passed him and filled out the form he would bring it back to us. If the doctor refused him, that would end it. If he accepted him, we would attach the form to his application and the two references, whom we had consulted, and if everything was satisfactory we would send it to the office of Immigration in London, and if approved we would get a warrant and would bring the man forward. That obviated all publicity; it obviated the necessity of the man appearing at the central place, possibly an objectionable place, in company with a number of others, and appearing upon that occasion or on another date for his medical examination, with an unknown doctor, with all the publicity it involves, and

his loss of time—because he must attend at these places on the date fixed, and he must go to his employer and ask for leave to get off and attend on that date for civil and medical examination.

Q. That procedure you have outlined would just be as lengthy as the procedure now?—A. I beg your pardon.

Q. The procedure you have outlined just now would be just as lengthy as the procedure that is now adopted?—A. No. The procedures are very different. The procedure now is this; I come to you, having got in touch with you as I outlined; I get you to say that you are desirous of emigrating to Canada, I get you to fill out the forms of application, the same as previously, and you fill out the two forms of reference as in the previous instance. I give you something which you did not have before. I give you a small card and tell you to go to the nearest photographer and get a photograph and put it on the card. You keep that card until you are called upon for examination. I say, now, we will communicate with your references, which is the same as in the previous instance. If we are satisfied, we will then forward your form of application and your references to the nearest Dominion Emigration Agent, of which there are nine or ten (I think nine) so that all the organizations that are recruiting have to file all their applications in that district with that one agent. What does the agent do? He may not be satisfied with the references, and he himself communicates with the references. But we will assume that he is satisfied; he then writes a letter, of which I have a copy here, to you, telling you that you are to appear at a certain place upon a certain date for civil examination. In that letter he says that he does not guarantee that you will be medically examined upon that date, but that you may have to appear at another place upon another date for medical examination.

The man gets that letter, and goes to that place for a civil examination. He finds he has to beg off from his work, to get time to go, because it is during the day time generally. Then, if he is not medically and civilly examined at the same time, he gets a subsequent notice telling him that he has to go to that place or to another place for medical examination, and that he has to bring a card with him. He goes, and if he is passed medically, the doctor stamps his card, which is assumed to entitle him medically to entrance into Canada. As I explained this morning, it does not entitle him, because there is an examination at the port. You see the latter system involves much more travelling about and much more expenditure of time on his part than the old system.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. And the possible risk of losing his job?—A. The risk of losing his job, for this reason; there was a ruling of the Department, I do not know whether it has since been amended, but it had not been a short time before I left the other side—that one of his references must be from his last employer, and in a good many cases, where it is farm labour, they refuse to ask for references from the last employer, feeling no doubt that the employer would resent it.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. I think Mr. McAllister stated here that you were spending a considerable amount more money in the United Kingdom than on the Continent for immigrants?—A. Yes.

Q. He said twenty, I think, but perhaps one hundred times as much, if I remember correctly; is that correct?—A. I am not in a position to say that the figures are one hundred to one.

Q. I do not wish to tie you down to any particular figure, but you spend a considerably larger sum in the United Kingdom than on the Continent?—A. As far as my own Department is concerned, we are spending \$50 in Great Britain for every single dollar we are spending on the Continent.

Q. You do not get many agriculturists coming from the Old Country to this country?—A. We get all we can. The supply is very limited.

Q. Do you find a great demand for labour in the industrial centres of this country?—A. Well, we have not experienced that this year. Last year we did. We had a request from the Builders' Association to bring forward a group of carpenters, plasterers and painters.

Q. Industrialists?—A. Yes.

Q. That was last year?—A. Yes.

Q. You were able to supply them?—A. No.

Q. You could not supply them?—A. No, we were not able to supply them, because we had to advise them that while we could recruit men of that class in Great Britain they would have to pay the full tariff fare, and we did not feel that they could pay the full tariff fare. If they were willing to advance the full tariff fare and collect it after the men arrived, we would be able to get them. They asked us if we could get them provided the fare was advanced and an agreement signed to repay it. I said we could not do that, it was illegal, that all they could do would be to wait for these men to arrive at Quebec and get them to sign an agreement there. They asked, what could they do about it if they would not sign the agreement after they arrived there. We said that they would be out the fare.

Q. Generally speaking, the Dominion has a sufficient supply of labour for the industrial centres of Canada?—A. That I cannot answer.

Q. You are more concerned with the supply required for the agricultural sections of Canada?—A. My opinion is that, considering the conditions that exist in Canada to-day, I do not feel that we would be justified in opening the door and inviting immigration to any large class of common labour, skilled mechanics, clerical help or professional men, because I do not believe that they could be rapidly absorbed, and therefore I feel that the policy should be, as it is, largely limited to the encouragement of the immigration of agriculturists and agricultural labourers, feeling that as we can extend our agricultural development we will be able to prove by some other figures we have produced, that each family of five placed in agricultural occupations, justifies the employment of 1.73 men in industrial life, to supply that portion of their budget which I referred to before. So I am not in favour of opening the door to an unlimited movement of people other than agriculturists, agricultural labourers, domestics and boys.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. When you say, "opening the door," you mean assisting by assisted passages, because the door is open at the present time to people from Great Britain?—A. The door for admission of people from Great Britain of any class is wide open; any skilled mechanic, any common labourer, any professional man or any clerical help is perfectly free to leave Great Britain or any of the preferred countries to Canada, paying, of course, full fare. It is only from the non-preferred countries that we are restricted to the movement of agriculturists and agricultural labourers, and in Great Britain the only classes entitled to reduced fares are agriculturists, agricultural labourers, domestics and boys.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? If not, we thank Colonel Dennis for his appearance before the Committee.

Witness retired.

The CHAIRMAN: We have in the room this afternoon Colonel Stibbard, who is in command of a camp for the training of soldiers before they are discharged from the British Army. He tells me that there are about 30,000 a year who go through a special course of training six months before discharge takes place, with a view to fitting them for emigration to the Dominions. I think

[Mr. J. S. Dennis.]

it would be very interesting to the Committee to hear Colonel Stibbard for a short time. He is here and is willing to explain the work he is doing. Is it the wish of the Committee to hear Colonel Stibbard?

Colonel JAMES STIBBARD called.

WITNESS Mr. Chairman, what I am saying now is quite unofficial. I am a serving officer of the British Army, and as such I am not allowed to touch politics or anything in connection with them.

Our scheme is this: every year from the British Regular Army about 35,000 men are discharged. Those men go over into civil life, and they are at a stage when they have to make a fresh home, they have to go out into fresh conditions of life, and it occurred to some of us about seven years ago that if we could only get these men, during the last six months of their service, to a training centre and train them for some vocation in after life, it would give them a better start in after life. One of the main things we train for is agriculture in the Dominions. At the present time, suppose a man is enlisted for eight years, he only serves seven and a half years with his Unit. The last six months of his service he leaves the Unit and proceeds to the training centre. That applies to every Unit, so that every month we have from various Units in the British Army men who are then just starting the last six months of their service. Those men are then struck off military duty. The whole idea is, to give them a sound agricultural training.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. In the six months?—A. In the six months. Possibly you will say that it is not possible in six months, but something is better than nothing. I think you will agree with that. For every eighteen men they have an instructor who is an expert agriculturist; he may have had experience in Canada.

These men have a good time with the horses. We have at the present time say sixty or seventy horses. They are not the English type of horse. They are a light draught horse which moves much quicker than the English horse, and we believe is about coincident with the type of horse used in the Dominion. Some of them are good steady horses, but some are shipped to the centres rough and unbroken. So that the men get a good horse training. A man learns to plough, he can handle a team of two, four, six or eight, he can do all the work on a farm. He also learns to milk. He starts to milk at five o'clock in the morning, again at midday, and again at half past eight, half past nine or ten o'clock.

The idea of this strenuousness is that the centre is not only a training centre in agriculture, but it is a testing centre to test the man as to whether he can stick the conditions of farm life; it is a testing centre as much as a training centre. That applies to the married man.

Then with regard to the married families. When there is a good married scheme out, we recruit for that. We go around to all the units of the British Army and we tell them what the scheme is. Six months before a man is due to leave the service, he leaves the unit he is with and he goes to the training centre with his wife and all his family. He takes the ordinary training in general farming, arable farming, dairy farming, a little pig farming, and poultry work, and so on. The wife also takes a course in poultry farming; she learns all about incubators, plucking and dressing poultry, and so on. She learns to milk, and to make any butter necessary for her own house. They also have quite a course of real good domestic training. It is all very well to say that they are already wise, but it does not follow that they know housecraft. We find a good many wives who cannot darn a pair of stockings. They are given a good training in housecraft, in regard to clothing, and all that sort of thing.

[Col. James Stibbard.]

The children are also taught to milk. They are left off from schooling. If they are too young they take half a day's schooling and half a day's training. These children learn to milk, and they take a great interest in the farm life.

We have about the finest types of men you will find in the British Isles. These men are specially recruited when they join the army, and more than half that apply for recruitment are refused. So we start with a good start. They also have to stand a good educational test when they join the army. Their physical and educational training continues in the army. We work with that material, and receive it in fine physical condition, and if we can train them and demilitarize them, get them civilianized in their habits and in their methods, and send them straight over to any scheme that Canada or Australia may have, there is never one day's hesitation. We feel that these men are much better than they would have been if they had been allowed to drift into the ordinary civil world, drifting down the stream of unemployment—no stream runs up—they would be much worse men than they are when we take them in hand immediately. We generally arrange that they sail a few days before their discharge, and their discharge is then handed to them on the boat. That avoids their going home to see mother and all the sweethearts who hang around their necks and keep them from going.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. How many of these qualified men could you supply from the Old Country, in a year, roughly?—A. That depends upon your offers. If it is a good scheme that can be taken around to the units, and is a scheme which appeals to the men, you have 35,000 men to choose from this year from the army alone, and a corresponding number from the navy.

Q. What scheme or plan would they look for? What sort of plan should we have for their reception here? What is in your mind along that line?—A. I think what they really want, first of all, is a fairly good home to live in, either with the farmer, or very near akin to him. The next thing, in regard to Canada, is that they want a guarantee that they are not going to be pushed out into what they regard as the wilds in the winter. They are afraid of being cast off in the winter. This is their opinion, not mine.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. What proportion would be married and unmarried men?—A. The proportion leaving the army is about, we will say, ten to fifteen per cent.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. Married?—A. Married; the remainder single.

Q. What ago would they be?—A. The age varies. A man may enlist at eighteen years officially; they generally enlist unofficially at seventeen.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Of the men who get such training, do one hundred per cent still want to carry on along agricultural lines?—A. No, that is the whole point of the testing. We discover those who are unfit, and they discover themselves if they are unfit. I reserve the right, and it is a right that I fought for very keenly and still maintain, that where a man is found unsuitable for the work at any stage he is sent back to his unit. Any woman that is found to be unsuitable, even if the husband is most suitable, that family is sent back to its unit.

Q. As a practical farmer, if I were to demand from the hired help what you demand in the six months' training that you give these soldiers, I would never have a hired man.—A. Why.

Q. Because they would not submit to it. Any that you can get to come over here I can assure you that they will make an ideal number one western farmer.—A. We do not bring them up too soft. We would rather go to the other extreme, and make conditions so strenuous that when they do come to people like you, they say, "Thank God, we are in a happy home."

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. They do not want to come here and then find themselves pushed back in the wilds in the winter?—A. That is the point.

Q. Our farms are not usually in the wilds, but if they had a guarantee of a year's employment before they left the Old Country would that be sufficient?—A. I think it would, because they are not babies. They have been used to roughing it, and have been all over the world, and are the best physical men there are in England, probably. That guaranteed anchorage, we will say would put them on their feet. After that, they would be able to fend for themselves, if necessary.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I found that they were tremendously afraid of the Canadian winter.—A. That is the point.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Is it the severity of the winter, or being out of employment?—A. I have been with this scheme about seven years. I was the initiator of the idea, and unfortunately, they gave it to me to do. We have always had men anxious to go to Australia, and we have not had them anxious to come to Canada. There are two reasons. Both the married man, the wife, and the single fellows say, "I have had enough of roughing it, and I do not like the cold weather in addition". There are really two things that keep them back from Canada; the cold weather, and the fear of being out of work in the winter. I was coming up from Quebec to Montreal, and I spoke casually to three different farmers, just talking generally to find out things. I said, "How are you getting on? How is the seeding going on?" "The seeding is going on all right," and they told me how they employed their men. They said that the job is to get the men in the harvest time. "You take him on for the day, and he may leave you in the morning, and then you have a lot of trouble". I said, "What about the man who is turned out at the end of the harvest, where does he go to?" It is something that seems never to have entered their heads. They would think more of taking care of their cattle during the winter than of the men who worked for them. That was the impression I got. There is one other thing. In this training centre of ours—and I think the people who have seen it recently will agree with me; I know Colonel Dennis has seen it—we not only give the men a strenuous time from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m., with the general farming, the dairy farming and so forth, but we give him a good idea of pig farming. Every man goes to the forge. All our horses are shod by our students only, under supervision, of course. All the repairs to agriculture implements are done by students only. All the equipment made for the poultry farming—and we have a poultry farm there with 600 layers on it—is made by our own students. The work is done with small incubators and each man has his own incubator, and works it himself and he is judged, either approved or kicked, accordingly. Then again, they have their pig farms, and every man who goes through the winter course can kill a pig, he knows the temperatures, and can scald it, he can cut it up, he can make the by-product such as sausages and lard and he can salt hams and bacons. We have had tons of them since Christmas. That is additional help which might be useful in winter employment.

[Col. James Stibbard.]

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. How many of these centres have you?—A. Only this one. It used to be at Catterick, but that is now required for military purposes and we have a new camp in the south of England where we are absolutely to ourselves and not mixed up with any military affairs at all, so we can demilitarize our men.

Q. How many acres on that farm?—A. One thousand, at the present time. I have a plan here if anybody wishes to see it.

By Mr. Egan:

Q. You have possibilities for over 500 men?—A. Oh, yes. The accommodation as it stands at the present time without spending a penny on it, is for 1,800.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. Do you think it would be feasible to attempt to give them a training in this country under the same system you have there?—A. Two things are against it. I think it would be better from the point of view that you have the right atmosphere here, but they have got to get here first, and that will cost money. And then too, what is going to happen to misfits? Will you send them straight back again? That will cost, will it not? Another thing is that the misfit going back from Canada will not be an advertisement for Canada. You would hear about the one, but not about the thousand suitable ones.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Those men are under army pay?—A. Yes, they are absolutely in the army, standing by. Instead of doing their foot drills, they are preparing for farm work.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Is your association in touch with the Government here? Are you in a position to supply men? For instance, I had a letter from a farmer in my county asking for a certain kind of man, that he would like a man and his wife from the Old Country to assist on the farm. That would mean a house and perhaps a little piece of land. Now, in such cases as that where a man writes in and asks perhaps for a single man, or a man and his wife, are you in a position with the Government so that it could be passed on to you and the application filled?—A. You would make your application direct to your Government, and your Government would go to our Government, who would send it to me. That is the procedure. Or, if you like to shorten it, and your Government does not mind, if you write me direct, having known me personally, you will get your man. I can get you one now. I can cable a man to-night. I have them "on tap", as it were.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Do you find any difficulty in having too many men of that type ready for the demand of this country?—A. No, we do not have enough. It is my candid aim to get more men to Canada.

Q. Is your mission here in order to get places for them or to advertise the men you have to bring out?—A. This is the point. I have come to Canada for the first time. I am going to every unit in the British army, on the Rhine and everywhere else, and I tell them of this scheme and explain it to the whole regiment. There are certain schemes contemplated here for next year, one of them being the pioneer settlement scheme. Already, we have booked fifty of these married families for that scheme. I am going around to the British units telling them about that scheme. In my wisdom, and by the courtesy of Colonel Dennis, I have come out here to see the place first, which is a very

wise procedure, and I have come to Ottawa and I say, "Please show me where you will put your pioneer settlers for next year, so I will know all about it, and can go back and tell them all about it." But it seems I am a little too early for you.

Q. You have too many on the waiting list?—A. No. We have not started yet. I have come to Canada to get the Canadian atmosphere, and then I will go back to the British units and tell them of the scheme.

By Mr. Ross (Moose Jaw):

Q. Under the present conditions you have a number of men in training?—A. It is going on as usual.

Q. And to any farmer who can give good employment to one of these men, you can supply the man?—A. Yes. I have ten or fifteen coming on the 15th of May, so I learned to-day.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. I understood you, in answer to a question by Hon. Dr. Edwards, to say that you could supply him with a man to-morrow. Have you in training at the present time a sufficient number to supply all the demands in this country?—A. No, I have not. The men are quite free to go where they like. I can send any number of men to Australia, but I cannot get enough to come to Canada.

Q. Approximately what wages do you assume would be reasonable for those coming to Canada?—A. I do not think the wages count so much. If you give them the skilled rate and the skilled conditions of the district they will be satisfied. Pay them as skilled men.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. What do they get in Australia?—A. The average is 30 shillings, plus board and lodging, raising to £2 and £2.10. They go in very largely for the share farming principle thereto.

Q. That is 30 shillings per week?—A. Yes.

Q. And board and lodging?—A. That is the minimum.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. A few moments ago you mentioned the unemployment in the winter season and you spoke as if those employing help seemed to take more interest in their cattle than in those whom they employed. Do you think they understand that so far as western Canada is concerned—the part of Canada where a great many of them would be employed in the summer months—when it comes to the winter season it is not lack of sympathy, but if the farmer keeps them they will be sitting around for five or six months and doing nothing?—A. That is a domestic affair which you will have to solve.

Q. That is the trouble. We have not solved it and do not know how to solve it. It is not lack of sympathy.—A. I do not think it is.

Q. The farming business in the west, for reasons I need not go into now, is not profitable enough for a man to keep help for five or six months without their doing anything.—A. I think general farming is the keynote of the situation.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. How long has this scheme been in operation?—A. It was initiated seven years ago.

Q. How many have you sent to Canada?—A. I cannot give you the number.

Q. Approximately.—A. Oh, a couple of hundred or three hundred a year. We started in a small way. We were not given a government grant to start with; it was started off my own bat, and my own finances which I borrowed, and my own G.O.C. went bailee for it.

Q. Did some of them come out under the Three Thousand Family Scheme?
—A. Yes, some of them. I am going around to see them now.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. I think the Committee is very much interested in what you have already said. I do not know how long you have been in Canada but have you any suggestion to make to the Committee, from what you have gathered since coming here? It is information we are after. I happen to represent a part of western Canada which has, I think, one of the most purely English settlements in Canada, the colonists who are celebrating their 25th anniversary this summer. There is no finer settlement anywhere, and if you have any suggestions to make, I think the Committee would like to hear them.—A. There is an old saying that some of them rush in where angels fear to tread, and I am one of those. If I could arrange in my program for one night in Ottawa on my return, when I have seen more and learned more, then I might have some sort of scheme in my mind, but I want to see how it would work first. I should be an awful fool to prescribe for my patient before I really understood the conditions or the symptoms.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. If your trained men were given a guarantee of a year's employment with board and lodging, and the married men assured of a home into which they could go, that would pretty nearly meet your requirements?—A. Yes, but we want that very definite and not changed every year.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. There is a scheme in New Brunswick you have some knowledge of?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you been studying it?—A. No; I have only just arrived.

Q. You have heard of this scheme in New Brunswick?—A. Yes, and I know a bit about it.

Q. You propose to take advantage of that scheme?—A. There again I will not commit myself at this stage.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Did I understand you to make the statement that one great objection raised by the men who had been trained under your scheme, was the seasonal unemployment?—A. That is the great objection.

Q. How does that compare with Australia?—A. There is no seasonal unemployment in the part of Australia we supply for. We simply go after western Australia.

Q. And the parts you supply men for when they get a position at \$30 or \$35 a month, they are assured of it being a twelve months job?—A. Yes, that is certain.

Q. And these men object to the agricultural possibilities in this country only giving employment for the summer months?—A. They do not like it. They want to go into a good, steady and permanent job. They have had enough dodging about, and want to get a home.

By Mr. Ross (Moose Jaw):

Q. Is it your intention to travel across Canada while you are here?—A. Yes.

Q. To look the farming conditions over throughout Canada?—A. Yes.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until May 4, 1928, at 11 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 4th, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

H. BARTON, Professor of Agriculture, Macdonald College, called.

THE CHAIRMAN: Doctor Barton will you give us your views on immigration.

THE WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Agricultural Committee: I may say that I hardly knew just what I was coming here for, or just what was expected of me, but I welcomed the opportunity to appear before you, not that I have any desire to make a speech on immigration as such, although I have been interested in it, of course, and I do not know that what I have to say will deal specifically with the matter of which Mr. Kay (the Chairman) made special mention.

My connection with immigration is a limited one. We have only what one might call a miniature project under the direction of Macdonald College, a joint undertaking with the Canadian Pacific Railway on a very small scale, somewhat unique, I believe, in some respects, but after all I might submit this thought as a result of what little experience we have had thus far, that it might be regarded as a laboratory experiment, and sometimes one can discover, as you know, in a laboratory experiment, things which are more difficult to find in a field experiment. My major interest is in agriculture and it is from that standpoint and that angle that any remarks I have to make will be made. As I say, I have not come with any set speech. I have one or two thoughts, perhaps ideas, and possibly with your help I may manage to develop them. I think in the last analysis immigration is essentially an agricultural question, and while I do not want to be critical I am not at all sure that it has been approached from that point of view. If agriculture in this country offers attractive opportunities then I think a good many of the immigration difficulties naturally solve themselves. On the other hand, if there is stagnation in agriculture, if it is not attractive to our own people, let us say, I do not think it is reasonable to expect that it will be to other people, and if our people cannot face the issues involved in agriculture and solve them successfully then I think we are expecting a good deal of outside people to expect them to do so.

I take it you are as familiar with rural conditions as possibly I am, but for the purpose of presenting my point of view I want to ask you to look at the average rural district in eastern Canada, because I am more familiar with that, and what I have to say has more reference to eastern Canadian conditions than to the west, although from what I know of the west I think my remarks—particularly some I may make a little later—may not be without some application to western conditions.

Here is what I find in the average eastern rural community. They vary, of course, as you know. I find not many abandoned farms. I mention this because that is something we have not heard so much about. There are, as you know, what might be called abandoned farms but they need not cause us, and they certainly do not cause me any serious concern, because they have been abandoned in many cases for good reasons and perhaps should remain abandoned

[Professor H. Barton.]

until such time as conditions and possibilities make their use more possible than is possible under present conditions. So the abandoned farms question is not a matter of serious concern to me at any rate. I find a lot of farms for sale, and I think that is suggestive. In practically every rural community there are farms for sale at prices that apparently should be reasonable, and should be attractive. I am not going into the question of land value; there is a lot involved in that, I know, but I am speaking generally of the prevailing prices and the prospects that I am led to believe exist. I think that there should be every improvement in land value. Take the situation as we find it; we have plenty of farms for sale. We have not got agriculture working to capacity in these rural districts on the farms that are occupied. Why are a lot of these farms for sale? Well, there are various reasons. Many of them are not fully manned. Some of them are not producing to anything like their capacity. The conditions vary, but there are what I might call—the term was suggested to me in a book I read sometime ago, and I think it is quite applicable—tired farms in our districts.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Did you say farms, or farmers?—A. I said farms, but you can take the two, because there are also a good many tired farmers. I do not want to paint a dark picture; I am as optimistic as anybody could be, and I am going to propose that more of our people should be encouraged and helped to get into agriculture. I am trying to take a fair and square look at this situation, and that is as I see it in our rural districts in eastern Canada. Incidentally, I want to suggest, in that connection, that I do not think this so-called settlement question should be considered in the light of western possibilities only. There is not only room, but there is an absolute need for the reinforcement of our rural communities throughout eastern Canada. That is the situation as I find it, and there is the problem.

I am not forgetting for one moment my original premises. If we had a going agriculture, a buoyant agriculture, an attractive agriculture with opportunities bristling in it, I submit that the immigration problem would solve itself very largely, and the immigration machinery would be largely a transportation question, and the land settlement would be a mere formality. That is not the problem.

There is one other observation I want to make. There is a condition that is becoming more apparent all the time, and more obvious to me as I go about. I am in a special position, in a favoured position, I think I may say, as far as observation is concerned. I am interested in boys, chiefly farm boys and I am interested in agriculture generally. So I am looking for farm boys, and trying to observe them. This is what I found in regard to farm boys. I am not going to talk about them moving off the farms, that is an old story, but I am going to talk about them moving towards the farms. A lot of them have gone, and some of them have come back. Some of them have explored the possibilities in Detroit and elsewhere, and have suffered some disillusionment. Those possibilities are not as attractive as they were, after all. Take the average farm boy as we have him, with the educational equipment that he has, and talk about all the city opportunities. What is there for him if he goes to Montreal, or if he comes to Ottawa, or if he goes to Detroit? He is in luck if he gets an immediate job, although I would not want to have the responsibility of placing very many of them right now. Where does that average boy land in ten or fifteen years? I am not going to dwell upon that; I just suggest that. Some boys are commencing to see this thing there for themselves. Here is what I find in every rural district. The next generation of farmers is going to be composed largely of the farm boys of these districts, no matter what happens. There are farm

[Professor H. Barton.]

boys in these districts who would farm if they could, but they cannot. They cannot, chiefly for one reason, and that is that they have no financial provision within their reach. To start a farm to-day is a different proposition to what it used to be; a boy cannot start on his own feet. When I was a younger boy than I am now, quite a few years ago, the situation was entirely different. He has got to have money to-day.

I do not believe there is any clamour for agricultural credit throughout eastern Canada, generally speaking, and I do not want to go into that question. But the one place where I believe there is a need for financial provision is for the farm boy. He would like to farm. I know some farm boys who are starting, in spite of no financial provision. I believe these boys, through hard work, and a low standard of living on their part, and with the girls that they may persuade to share their lot, will succeed. But that is not a very encouraging spectacle for either the boy or the girl; it takes a lot of courage to face a proposition of that kind.

There is no financial provision for these boys. There is some for other people, \$2,500, and I think that we might well consider giving the same consideration to our farm boys in this country. That is not divorced entirely from immigration, it bears directly on it. As far as immigration is concerned, we have got to look more to the young boy than to the old man, especially if we are thinking in terms of British stock. Our hope lies with the boy, to my way of thinking, as far as future farming goes.

Suppose this Old Country boy comes to this country and goes into our districts. He finds, as I say, farming at a low ebb in many places, and a standard of living that will not appeal to him if he has had any opportunities at all before. He sees farm boys themselves not taking up farms, and he sees farms around there that offers splendid opportunities for Canadian farm boys. That is a stagment situation that is not very inspiring to a newcomer, but that is what it is in the average rural community throughout the east.

I think that not only should we recognize that situation there, the help for our Canadian farm boys, but we need something more than that. The average farm boy needs more than that \$2,500 alone, because that is not enough. You would not start your own boy on a \$2,500 farm, nor would I. I do not know that I would start him on twice that. Little nibbles at these things are no good, they are only tantalizing. Something more than that is needed. These boys, who are the farmers of the future—farming is changing, whether we realize it or not; it is in a transition stage. There is a commercialization of the whole thing taking place, and we are looking at it more and more in terms of commerce, and we will have to get more volume of business. The turnover is not big enough, and we cannot hope to get the margin of profit sufficient to provide a decent standard of living with the average output on easter Canadian farms. We have got to increase that volume of business, and our progressive farmers know that. How are they doing it? It can be done by specializing, possibly, with certain types of crops replacing others, or by the enlarging of their holdings. The thing calls for greater ability than the old time family farms, on which we were content to make a living, and it calls for more equipment. I would like to see these boys get the kind of equipment they ought to have, and will need, to make the most out of the farming possibilities that we are going to have in the next twenty-five or fifty years.

We should do something for them in the way of general directive help, for one thing, and we should provide a number of them so that they will be guide posts, as it were, and the leaders upon whom others will build. We want to raise the whole level of farming in this country. It doubt very much is immigration is doing that; I think it is doing the reverse.

How are we going to raise this level of farming? As I say, we have our own farm boys, and there can be not better stock than that. Let us give them

a first class chance, if we can. I think farming is good enough to encourage our farm boys to enter into it, rather than to take the average job that will come to them. I will guarantee that in fifteen or twenty years the average farm boy would be just as well off, or better in most cases, than his friend that goes to the city. I have found that to be the case.

But to go back to my original idea, this raising of the level and reinforcing the rural communities with our farm boys; we should give them the best opportunity we can, and as much directive help as possible. We ought to specially equip—and here is where I come in—at least a certain proportion of these farm boys to be the leaders for the rest, to be the pivots of the general development. How can that be done? We are doing it now, in a very casual, haphazard way. We have a lot of agricultural machinery in this country in the service of the farmers—we have a lot of it right here in Ottawa—and there is a lot of good government money being spent on it in every province in Canada. I do not want to say one disparaging remark about it, in fact I think it is very necessary and is doing a very useful work, indirectly, in the service of the farmer. That is a very good thing. But it would be a more direct way to do it, by equipping a special number of these farm boys in order that they may help not only themselves, but be a pivot, as it were, whereby others will be helped. After all, you will admit, I think—and I can pay no greater compliment to this co-called agriculture service—that a lot of the progress in agriculture in this country is due to that service. There is not a farmer who has not had the advantage of it, although he may not be aware of it. The improvement in farming in this country, as well as in many other countries, as well as in many other countries, is directly traceable to this service machinery of which I spoke.

If it is possible for somebody out at the Experimental Farm here to give that kind of service to the farm people, surely it ought to be possible for a man with that training to give it to himself, first, on a practical farm, and, through his operations, to other people around him. What I want to do is to multiply all these little experimental farm units, or demonstration units, whatever you want to call them. They would reinforce the whole farming community with people who have had some capacity for their job and who can do the kind of thing, right on their own spot, that is being done in a more indirect way throughout the country. We are not doing that kind of thing to the extent we should be.

The college trained man, apart from the opportunity that is given to him for service, gets no recognition from any government. He ought to be the best risk in this country, as far as farm investment is concerned. If he is not, then our colleges are failures. When I tell you that our colleges are responsible for the training of the men that constitute this other service, surely that is significant testimony on their behalf.

The idea that I want to put forth there is this. Just as it should be possible for this Canadian boy who wants to farm, and who has a good apprenticeship, has equipment, and who is first class material to undertake farming, so should it be possible for the boy who equips himself still further, to the extent of at least two years—and we have some thirteen or fourteen institutions throughout Canada that are doing that now—so should it be possible to give that boy and even better opportunity, because he is a better risk. There is nothing available to him now.

We are told at times that our boys do not go back to the farm, they go into the service. Two explanations of that can be justified. There is opportunity in the service, and there is a need there for some of them, while here is no provision for them to go elsewhere unless they have got it themselves. Many of them are going, but not any such number as should be. If it were possible for a boy who has not only had a first class farming apprenticeship—because that is fundamental, and no college training in the world can replace it; the education

the boy gets from the farmer is absolutely fundamental and inseparable—where he has this additional training, we will have the kind of equipment we are going to need to get the most from farming in the future. Here is my suggestion. That boy should have financial provision within his reach to farm; not \$2,500, or even \$5,000; it has got to be better than that. It only means advancing money on good security.

Those are two specific suggestions, but I want to make a bigger one that will include all of them, and that is this: since this immigration question, to my mind, resolves itself into one of agriculture and the development of agriculture—I have only touched upon two special suggestions that I make in that connection as affecting the boys, but there are a lot of other issues—there is the whole question of commercial direction, the question of co-ordination. This question is becoming more complex all the time. What we need most is not an immigration board but a land development board, call it what you will. We do not want something that would study the thing for a few weeks, but continuously study this whole question of development in our rural districts, not only for our own people, but also for those who are coming here. This is being done by separate organizations now, as you know, going along their own little streets, so to speak, and there is a good deal of duplication.

I am going to refer you to what resembles this same board, although it is focussed on a little different angle—The Empire Marketing Board of Great Britain. It is focussed on marketing, but is not limited to marketing at all. Our's would be focussed on land development, if you like, but would not be limited to settlement. They are spending £5,000,000 per year through the Empire Marketing Board. It has various features—I am not going to go into them in detail—there is the question of selling, the question of production, and scientific research, all being taken care of and co-ordinated and facilitated and encouraged through that organization.

There is a scheme submitted now for the Colonies—I do not mean the Dominions, but the Colonies—with an estimated budget of £2,000,000 per year for agricultural development, and chiefly research.

Our problems are different, as I see them. If we had some kind of machinery that would weld all the different agencies that we have together in some way, that could focus on the agricultural aspects more immediately, but would not overlook such things as research, our experimental farms, our agricultural colleges, our land settlement, and all the other types of activities that would come within, it would accomplish much.

Look at the rural situation as I have tried to bring it before you this morning. Study that situation from the standpoint of its needs, and what can be done to strengthen it immediately? I have my finger on the farm boy question, as being one that appeals to me in that connection.

There is a type of thing that would be of direct concern to a land development board in this country, and that is research in pure science, and economics as well. Perhaps the more immediate activities of such machinery would focus, as I said, on the land settlement question, and the land development question, but the whole thing is objective. At present there is no organized objective, and to the people we are bringing here it largely appears to be a force pump proposition.

I have only one further thought, and that is in connection with the Old Country. I have not lived in the Old Country, but I have been interested in the boys there. We are not interested in immigration as such, it is not our function, but we are interested in boys, and we are interested in raising the level of farming. We are interested in interjecting into the farm population here and there people who will be pivotal, who would be especially equipped, and could render special service and value to that community. In the Old Country, as you know, we have thousands of boys leaving the public schools every year,

and having increasing difficulty in finding opportunities. There are not the openings to-day in the army and navy, as you were told here yesterday. Instead of increased openings, there are hundreds of men leaving and wanting opportunities elsewhere, as you were told by Colonel Stibbard, whom I met at the College a few days ago. These boys want to come to Canada, and if they come to Canada, what is open to them? Agriculture. Many of them have not the slightest idea of what is involved in agriculture, but we do all we possibly can to help. These boys are not just average boys, they have had some educational advantages, and have some intellectual equipment. So we ask ourselves, "What can we do to provide a special opportunity for this special boy?" Well, we are limited, and cannot do anything on a very big scale. We tried out something and we organized a little project whereby we would offer special training and help to these boys. We were very much concerned about going the right type of boy, and that presents some difficulty. We have had some experience in that connection with our proposition. We say to the public school boy who wants to come to this country, "Macdonald College will undertake to look after you and help you to find a suitable farm when you come to this country, and a suitable farmer"—which is even more important—"from whom you can get your primary and fundamental farm education. That will be the first class to which you will go, but if you have never had any farming experience in the Old Country we will give you a little training before we send you out to that farm. Then you will come back to us and then we will give you a little technical equipment. You have had a good foundation, but we will give you more technical equipment as applied to agriculture. You will spend five months with us, and then you will go back to the farm again the next summer. That is the plan, as we are working it. Then we will bring this boy back and then he will go back to the farm again. We will not stop there, but will continue to give him all the help and direction we can. To-day we have about one hundred of those boys who have arrived at the point where they are quite ready to carry on. Three years is not enough for the average fellow, as half of his time is spent on the farm and half in college. We have some of them that are about ready and they are considering propositions right now. My advice to those boys is not to take any low grade proposition; I want to see them get something first class. Some of them have got financial resources that will enable them to do that, but many of them have not. It usually happens that the boy with the limited financial resources is the boy that is the hardest worker. Here is this boy that has spent his time equipping himself thoroughly, and what is to happen to him?

One boy said to me recently, "I do not propose to go on a hundred acre farm where I will have to work my heart out, that does not appeal to me." As the average farm is conducted, a hundred acres is not enough, and it did not appeal to him, and it does not appeal to the average boy who gets his eyes opened. These boys naturally, should be first class risks, and they should have special help, because they are away above the average. We cannot hope to interest them in a \$2,500 farm, any more than, as I say, we would want to interest our own boy in it.

We can get plenty of these boys, but we have discovered that if a boy has had a test in agriculture over there, he fits into the situation here much better. He has an idea of what is before him, and he is the boy who invariably does the best. Select these boys as you will over there—I do not mean boys from homes where agriculture has been absolutely foreign—and they will take to agriculture and rural life like ducks take to water. They are prepared to face all kinds of difficulty, and put up with what may even be hardships, because they like the life and they like the country. If they can see any possibilities in it at all they have not the slightest idea of breaking away from it. There is no difficulty in interesting these boys in country life.

I am aware that they have stations over there, the Imperial people, as Colonel Stibbard mentioned, but they are only flea bites after all, as I see it. If some scheme could be developed whereby the boys in the Old Country, those having no knowledge of agriculture, could get some little test over there to test themselves out, as it were, and be tested out. If there is a lot of unemployment over there—I do not know that there is; personally I did not see it when I was over there—and if there are thousands of young fellows that want to come to this country, it seems to me that that is the right thing to do with those fellows. This may look like an impediment or an obstacle to immigration, but I do not intend it as such. "Get on the farm in the Old Country and see what you can do there, what you like to do." The possibility of boys getting some special help in getting on to the farms in the Old Country and not be charged a special fee as obtains in many cases at the present time is important. Direct them toward agriculture there, to begin with. I do not think it is a vital matter that they be trained with Canadian wagons and Canadian harness. The fellow who comes from a farm in the Old Country very soon adapts himself to Canadian conditions, but what he needs over there is a taste of agriculture. I would like to see a bigger field in that direction. I do not know whether that is practicable or not, but if I were responsible for that over there, that is one of the things I would investigate. There is a lot of money spent on immigration in one way and another, and it seems to me that the expenditure with a view of putting Old Country boys on farms in the Old Country would be wise. The Old Country people do not relish our robbing them of their help—because that is really what it amounts to. We want Old Country people here and people with agricultural experience if we can get them. The farmers in the Old Country are none too well off now, as Colonel Dennis has told you, and we are trying to inject these fellows into agriculture and bring them here. Why not try to inject them over there? The farmers need help there in many cases as much as we need farm help here, and that in itself might be worth something, but above all, these fellows should have a chance, as I say, to get a taste of agriculture and explore its possibilities in some measure, and they will then have a far better idea of what is ahead of them when they come here, and they would fit into the situation and would adjust themselves with our people and be more valuable, and the wheels, as it were, would probably be better greased. That is how it works out in our little experiment. The farmers think that we have better boys than perhaps the average machinery, and when we ask them to take a boy they say, "Yes, I will take that boy, but what about him? Can he do anything on the farm?" and if we can say that he has had experience in the Old Country, that we have given him a test in the college, and that he is quite apt and can milk, and do this, that and the other thing, we have no difficulty in placing him right away, and there is no come-back with that boy. The other boy is an unknown quantity, and is a far bigger problem for us.

As I say, I have not any set form for my remarks, and I have rambled a good deal. I have only really four ideas—that is all. The first one is, that our rural communities throughout Canada need reinforcing and I claim that is a definite concern in any immigration consideration. They need reinforcing and need it with our own people and material here, as well as with outside people. We have the farm boys, but there is a stumbling block to their going in to agriculture, and I have tried to tell you what it is; financial provision is not within their reach.

Then I have tried to suggest this, that the whole level of farming ought to be raised, and it must be raised. There is only one way to do it. It has been raised only in one way in the past twenty or twenty-five years, and that is we want more intelligent, more understanding, and more able knowledge of the things we have to do, and I have suggested that if we take the practical method of giving as many boys training as we can and putting them out on the farms, seeing that they go, it will help a great deal. That is the second idea.

[Professor H. Barton.]

The third idea: I suggest there is need and room from the standpoint of immigration, because in the last analysis it hinges on the question of agricultural development, but not only from the standpoint of the various agencies and co-ordination, nor the standpoint of the exploring of the problems and possibilities which exist in any district—commercial people have it in another form, but we find there is not enough in it in agriculture, so the Government will have to aid us in the financing, and I want to see the same thing done in agriculture as is done in other callings. There is a splendid opportunity for it, and there is need for it, and that is why I suggest a definite piece of machinery—I call it a Land Development Board; and I suggest it would not be unlike, although not even an imitation, the idea which lies behind the Empire Marketing Board which has a grant of £5,000,000 a year from the British Government. That is not a governmental committee, but an advisory committee to the Government, and a committee including the best informed and ablest intellects from the standpoint of agricultural interests and that alone, which can be had in the Old Country. Then there is the fourth suggestion, which is only by the way, and I throw it out casually as an idea. The enlargement in some way, if possible, of the opportunities for boys in the Old Country to get some agricultural experience before they come here, and I can see only one way of doing that on a large scale. We cannot hope to train all of the farmers, although we will touch a lot of them. Neither can training, although good in itself, enable them to fit into the agricultural conditions as they exist by itself, but figuratively speaking we must work toward the enlargement of the opportunity for the boys to get agricultural training in the Old Country before coming to Canada. This must be done collectively, as we can never hope to reach the small isolated communities here and there.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Have you any specific suggestion as to what should be done in the case of the Canadian farm boys? Supposing a farmer is on the farm at the present time, and wants to retire, and does retire, and has only one son who can take his place. He may have four or five other sons all willing to farm: what would you do with the other four or five boys?—A. I think we are producing more boys in the rural communities than we need there, but we are not distributing them very well. There is bound to be an exodus. I do not think that means lack of progress; I think we must expect that, and we must expect it not only in farms, because our farms will be worked in larger units with more machinery and we will not need the man power we had before. Our rural organization will take care of some of it. We see it in the churches, we see it in the schools and we will see it in the villages and towns. The whole thing is on a bigger plan. The opportunity is, from the standpoint of the farmers, to put these boys on farms which are not now properly manned, upon which there are tired people quite ready to step out and would gladly see some local boy take hold of that farm and would give him every encouragement and the greatest possible consideration in financial treatment. They cannot finance the boys now, and the boys cannot finance themselves. Their fathers, while undoubtedly respectable farmers, do not feel like shouldering the responsibility of buying farms for the boys. Of course, there may be families from whom all the boys have left the farm. That is true, but what we are concerned about is getting the farms in a community manned by good boys, and that is not being done at the present time.

Q. What is your solution?—A. A financial provision for the right kind of boys. Give me that, and I will guarantee to go into almost any rural community and succeed in establishing these boys. I know boys who are going on to the farms without a cent in the face of the most trying difficulties, single-handed and with no capital.

[Professor H. Barton.]

By Mr. Coote:

Q. How much would you need for each boy? Give us some suggestion.—A. I would not say that every boy should have the same amount, of course, or anything of that kind.

Q. Give us a range—A. I would say this, to come down to brass tacks, that I would welcome for a start the same provision you are making to outside boys—\$2,500.

By Hon Mr. Forke:

Q. What did you say was given to outside boys?—A. I understand it is \$2,500.

Q. Who is giving that?—A. My understanding is that if a boy reaches 21 years of age in this country, and has spent so many years here, and has accumulated \$600, that he will be helped to the extent of \$2,500.

Q. That is a promise for the future?—A. That is what I had reference to.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. To my mind the witness has hit the real root of the trouble in connection with immigration, and I would like to ask one question. Would the problem be solved by the remedies you suggest without taking other steps to improve conditions on the farm? To my mind farming is, at the present time, with the prices paid, the rates of interest charged, the prices paid for help and all other costs—it is almost an impossible task to make a farm pay sufficiently to make it attractive. Will the measures you suggest, such as better education so that there will be leaders in each community, and so forth be sufficient? That is the point which is puzzling me.—A. I am not surprised that you ask that question. I have no panacea for the difficulties of agriculture or the difficulties of immigration. While I have been emphatic, I am seriously concerned with this whole question. I have spent—if I may make a personal reference—21 years in the service of farm boys and farm people and I know something of the difficulty of performing that service in the face of all kinds of odds. My view is necessarily a long distance view of that question. If there is to be a remedy at all I realize it can only be accomplished by one step at a time, but I would like to see the necessary machinery available to ensure that we are taking the proper steps in the right direction, and taking them as fast as we can. Even with agriculture as it is at the present time, I agree with you that it is not as attractive as it ought to be, commercially, even for the ablest farmers, but we must take it as we find it, and there are a lot of things over which we have no control. There are a lot of things which could be improved, and the only way for creating better conditions is to take one step at a time, and to create possibilities which are not apparent now and be able to take advantage of them. To my mind the remedy for that lies in first-class equipment for our farms. We have many people who are well equipped now, but we have not enough of them and it will be a process of evolution just as it was in this Empire Marketing Board. They are not looking for results for next year or the next year. The plan to which I have referred—I forget for how many years it was framed, but it was for over a considerable period of time.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Is your plan not somewhat along the line of the soldier land settlement scheme? Am I correct in saying that you take the boys selected, as you have indicated, and place them on the farms under a scheme somewhat like the soldier land settlement scheme, and that being the case, the prospects of success with such boys are much better than under the soldier land settlement scheme, and with less likelihood of loss to the Government in financing such scheme?—A. That is it, exactly.

[Professor H. Barton.]

By Mr. Coote:

Q. You made a statement regarding the necessity of increasing the output from the farms. Do you mean the output per farm with an enlarged farm or an increased output from the farms as they are to-day, with their present size?—
A. I mean both.

Q. Then have we not the problem of marketing the increased production from these farms?—A. I have always been asked that question. In my brief experience with farming people I have never made any suggestion, I do not believe, along what development lines they should undertake, that that question did not come up, whether it was in connection with hogs, poultry, or anything else. I can not look into the future to see what the requirements will be, but so far as one can tell at the present time—and we may get into deep water here—our markets are not getting any poorer at any rate, and there is no indication that the world's markets for agricultural products will be swamped. So far as the United States are concerned, I think if anything the evidence is a little the other way. You have the whole population question entering into that.

Q. We have not much access to the United States markets.—A. I think we will have access to them in spite of all the obstacles they put up.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. If the quality of our products is right, we will get the markets for them?—
A. Yes.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Do you believe that the law of supply and demand regulates the price?—
A. Of course I do, in a general way, although I think there is a certain accepted level for prices and it is unfortunate that that level is so low for agricultural products, generally speaking.

Q. Will you raise that level by increasing the production?—A. Well, you will probably have fluctuations, and there will be times when you will have a little too much output, but, generally speaking, that prospect would not worry me. After all, we have to take the situation as we find it and our Canadian farm output is only a fraction of the world's farm output. We are concerned with our own people, and I would be glad to see our people have double the products they have to-day.

Q. You are not engaged in marketing?—A. No.

Discussion followed.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. I have been waiting to hear Mr. McMillan's question. I agree with him and I think you will agree with me that our young Canadian boys are intelligent boys, and that these intelligent boys will drift to the centres which offer the best opportunities. I would ask you now if, in your opinion, the intelligent young men are choosing agriculture in equal numbers to those who are choosing other callings? I think perhaps that will give an indication as to which are the most favourable callings in Canada, the callings most favoured by the young men.—A. Do you mean farm boys or boys generally?

Q. Boys generally.—A. I do not think there is any question but the greater number are going into the city callings, but I want to qualify that with this statement, that in my observation there is definitely a greater tendency for farm boys to consider farming now than there was even a few years ago. That situation is growing, and I think it is partly because of the limited opportunities for the farm boys, as such, in the cities. I am not surprised at the city boy getting his opportunity in the city, although there are city boys looking toward the country, but not in any such large numbers. The city boy is brought up there with all the contacts—do not forget that—which make opportunity and

[Professor H. Barton.]

facilitate his securing employment. The farm boy has none of that at least, generally speaking. He does not equip himself for them, and so if the average farm boy with the average education should go to Montreal, we will say, tomorrow, what can he get to do if he has not some friend there who can put something his way? If he learns the delivery routes he may get a delivery wagon in time, he might go into a garage at this season of the year and get what looks to him like a very attractive daily wage for the time being, until next Fall, when he will face a different situation. I have had farm boys come to me and want opportunities in the city, and while I have connections in the city I can use, I find it difficult to materially assist the farm boys in the city.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. What proportion of the boys which pass through your hands with this what we may call probationary education stay with agriculture? You lose some of them?—A. Yes, there is a wastage and, of course, our experiment is still young. We are only in our third year and we have some 70 per cent of the boys still with us. We had our biggest loss the first year because the idea was put over a little too quickly, and we did not have time to exercise due care in selecting these boys. We are increasing our percentage, although the testing time is not so very long.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. In connection with the scheme you suggested as to financing: have you any detailed plan as to how that should be carried out, and to what extent, and if it is similar to a scheme now in vogue in Denmark?—A. I have no plan worked out or crystallized. I have an idea and I have thought about it for a long while. I presume Denmark would have provision through their own co-operative organizations. That is the only thing I know of in Denmark.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. We are spending vast sums of money in this country, running into many millions of dollars, in attempting to bring in new immigrants. In your opinion would it be better to take a great part of that money and use it in improving conditions in Canada, forgetting about the others, along the line of making our farms more attractive?—A. I do not want to be misunderstood in the attitude apparently taken. I am not opposed to immigration. We want more people, and we have to get them from the outside, but I claim that before we can do much for these people on a sound basis we have to put our opportunities in shape here, and the first thing we see when we look at that situation is that the opportunities are not here for our own people. Naturally if we make an attractive opportunity our own people will be the first to take advantage of it, and that fact will have a favourable effect on immigration, but whether money should be taken from immigration or provided over and above that, I would not like to say. We want all the people we can get who are of the right kind, but I am not at all optimistic about getting them in large numbers or making the best use of them with the opportunities and the situation as they are now. I think we want to get to the fundamentals of the situation and create opportunities for these people, and put our own house in order first.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Mr. Barton, would you think the proper step to solve our farming problems would be, a survey to find out if we are not trying an impossible task, that is, for farming even under the conditions you suggest, where the farmers must have better equipment, better financial arrangements and better knowledge of agriculture? It may be, and is my opinion, as far as western Canada is concerned, that we are trying to "force-pump" the farm. Would you not think we

[Professor H. Barton.]

should first find out the actual conditions?—A. I think the whole question should be carefully studied. I am not very sympathetic with the idea of a survey which has for its objective the idea of finding out how badly off we are. I think any survey I would want to make would be focussed on finding out what the possibilities of bettering the situation were, and I believe from my limited experience, there are possibilities which we have not begun to touch and particularly under conditions changing as they are in the east at the present time.

Q. Unless you know what the conditions are how can you decide what steps are wise to take?—A. Quite right. You can call it a survey if you like, although my idea of a survey for that purpose would be something of a very broad character. I do not wish to make special reference to the Ontario surveys with which I am familiar, for they are good things, and good fundamental work, but I think perhaps they stopped this survey entirely too soon, and they should have gone further and brought out the possibilities. Mr. Leach tried to do that, and the natural interpretation given to the public was that the farming situation was in very bad condition. We knew that without keeping books. But to come back to the original idea, there are districts here which have a prevailing type of farming in which there are special possibilities, and objectives they could set for themselves. Of course, there are the individual farmers' organizations, but I am not thinking so much of them as I am of the bigger things, speaking of farming as a whole. It is a question of study, call it survey, if you will. I think the whole situation should be studied, as you people are trying to do it here, but with a much smaller number. Somebody suggested a one-man committee, I believe, to study immigration. I would broaden it out and make it a one-man committee to study the whole question of agricultural development, as it concerns immigration. I think the two are tied together; they are inseparable.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. I think you made some reference to the standard of living on the farm?

—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would you give us your opinion as to whether it would be in the interests of the manufacturers and the railways in Canada to help us maintain a good standard of living on the farm? There would be more goods purchased, and the railways would have the hauling of those goods to the farm. I would like to have your opinion in regard to that point, as I think it is something that is often overlooked?—A. I do not think there is any question about that. I have been trying to do my little bit in establishing a better relationship and a better understanding between the business men and the farmers. After all, the business men's first concern is naturally their own, and the farmers' is their own. I spoke at the Commercial Club in Halifax a week ago and I met a lot of good business men there. I told them some things pretty frankly. I think the business man's attitude toward a lot of things has something to do with the farmer's attitude towards them. As we develop the farms we are going to have closer and closer business relationship, there is no doubt about that, and our people have got to be prepared to take their place in that business relationship. I do not know whether I am getting your question right, but what I surmise you have in the back of your mind, is that the business interests are not concerning themselves enough with the development of farming possibilities; is that right?

Q. I feel that they think that all they have to do is to bring in people who will produce something, but they overlook the other side of the picture; that the people they bring in, unless they maintain a good standard of living, are not going to purchase as much from those manufacturers and business men?—A. Oh, yes, quite.

Q. As the people who would endeavour to maintain a good standard of living on the farm?—A. I quite understand the business people taking that point of view with regard to the whole immigration question. That is why I

[Professor H. Barton.]

if it has been done before, but that is the field in which I work. I think that immigration depends entirely upon it, but I do not expect the business man to tell you that.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Do you think from the standpoint of the profit on the markets at home for what the farmer produces, that it would be advisable for the Government to open the door a little wider and bring in immigrants other than farmers?—A. If I were speaking for myself, I think I would open the door quite wide, as far as the different interests are concerned. The farm, at the present time, as I see it, is operating as a sieve for immigration, letting pretty nearly everything through. We are bringing people out here to the farms, but they do not stay. Some of them stay, but a great many of them do not. That is particularly true of eastern Canada. You know that, as well as I do. What we are doing is supplying labour for other requirements. I am not blaming anybody for that, but that is the situation as it obtains now.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. You stated a great deal about raising the standard of living on the farm. Do you think that you will be encouraged in doing that by flooding this country with Southern and Central Europeans?—A. No, sir, I do not. I must say that it goes against the grain a little bit to have to meet that kind of competition. On the other hand, there is another side to it, and I think we have got to be broadminded about it. A lot of these people change very quickly, and are very ready to adopt the best standards that we have to offer. You western people know much more about that than I do, and I am not going to get out of my pasture entirely. But that is what happens. But, as a farmer, I do not like to have to meet that sort of competition, the man who is willing to work more than I am—and I am willing to do my fair share—and whose whole family is willing to work and live on a basis on which I do not want to live, it does look a little like unfair competition to me. But I have no doubt that the next generation, and it will not be long coming, will demand a standard of living just as good as I have got. That is what happens.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. If we made farming in Canada attractive enough, would you say that we have enough young men in the United States and Canada to supply the needs for the next few years, without making any special effort to get in the prospective farmer from Europe? If the farm lad has left the farm for just such reasons as you have stated, and would like to get back on the farm, but has no capital to get back; are there enough of those young men, say between twenty-six and thirty-two years of age, willing to go back on the farm to-day, without bringing over any Europeans to fill this particular need of which you are talking?—A. That is a very difficult question to answer. I do not know that we need very many Europeans in Eastern Canada, at any rate. I am simply making a pretty general estimate of the situation, but that is my impression. If farming conditions were really attractive, as I think they ought to be, and if there was provision to enable our own boys to take advantage of those opportunities, I do not think it would be a question of encouraging, but would be simply a question of competition for the opportunity.

By Mr. Sinclair (Wellington North):

Q. I was very much struck with the remark of Mr. Lucas, that if the money spent in bringing immigrants out here was placed in hands such as your's, could you not get an unlimited number of boys and place them on farms? Surely, in five years, you would undertake to increase the population of Canada? I notice in the "Journal" to-day that we have lost 17,000 people more than we brought

in in five years. Under the scheme that you have proposed to-day, with the Government spending the money suggested by Mr. Lucas, in training the boys, could you not increase the population?—A. I am convinced that if I had the money to finance the farm boys I could put a lot of farm boys back on the farm.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. The principal reason why our boys are leaving the farm is that they have not sufficient capital to go on the farm?—A. I think that is one very important reason.

By Mr. Spencer:

Q. And the standard of living is not very attractive?—A. Yes. If I were assuming the responsibility for that, I would want more than simply the credit to finance these boys. I think we need some helpful direction to enable these boys to get the best out of agriculture. That is what I do with the boys we are assuming responsibility for now. I tell them, "we are prepared to stand by you until you are established, to give you all the help and direction we can." I think we can be of service to them, but if we could work with people collectively, with the right kind of organization, we could do a great deal more.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Are not the agricultural agencies of some considerable value?—A. There is no question about the value, but you only have one man in a whole county. After all, he is limited pretty much to his own resources. While he is a member of the Department of Agriculture, and gets help from that source, and works with the organization, he stands pretty much on his own feet in his service to these people.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. If there was such a thing as a demonstration to the farmers in their localities that they could make it pay, it would do a great deal more?—A. I would like to see far more of them. I am convinced that it can be done, and if it cannot be done we are wasting a whole lot of money. Take the province of Quebec, as one illustration that comes to me. I am not advertising my own college, but a boy came to us who could not speak English, and he had no experience of livestock. He is now in the service of the Livestock Branch to-day, and what has he done for the farmer? They could not do it for themselves, but he was equipped for the job. He has put their livestock equipment, in many cases, on a level that they never knew before. Why did he do that? Because he was equipped for his job, that is why. We have demonstrations everywhere of it.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Did you ever consider the advisability of the establishment of demonstration farms which would be established for the purpose of demonstrating that farming could be made commercially profitable?—A. I think it would be a very good idea psychologically, but I think there is a mistaken idea in the minds of people with regard to so-called model farms, like the one we used to come to Ottawa to visit years ago. This is what I think about that. Every farm is an individual farm and I think every farmer here knows that. What I might demonstrate on my farm, while it might be suggestive and illustrative and so on, may not be applicable to the farm right next to me. We can demonstrate general principles, but each farm has to be worked out, not only with regard to what the farm is, but with regard to what the farmer himself is. It is an individual unit, and this idea of setting up demonstration farms and saying, "Here, this will be the type of thing that will be good all over this community," to my mind is all poppycock. You can demonstrate certain general

[Professor H. Barton.]

principles and have some illustrations. In our organization we have two farms, and the thing I would organize on one farm, for straight commercial purposes, would be entirely different to the type of thing I would organize on the other.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. Are you running any portion of it with the object of trying to make it pay, make it show a commercial profit?—A. We are looking for all the revenue we can get, and watch every dollar as carefully as we can.

Q. I used to hear the matter discussed of flooding the markets for our products. I think the prospects to-day, in that respect, are better than they have ever been in my experience.

Mr. COOTE: There are a lot of farmers who have left the farms.

Mr. McMILLAN: I say that there is no prospect, in my opinion, of flooding any market for our products. Another observation I would like to make is this: we seem to be in favour of some immigration, and seem to be very much opposed to immigrants from any other quarter than from the British Isles. Now, in my own experience, in our own locality, recently we had some very good immigrants from Belgium, and from Scandinavia, and there was a bunch came out from Poland, German Poles, a year ago, and they are all showing up exceedingly well.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Do not these things usually regulate themselves? Take for instance, wheat. If the farmers of Canada were able to produce ten per cent more wheat on their farms, at a slightly less price, they would be just as well off as they are now. Would that not drive large areas in the States out of the wheat business altogether?—A. Probably.

Q. So that it would regulate itself?—A. It always does. I do not know that I can establish any clear cut position in that regard, but I know it is a weak position for anybody to take to say, "well, you are not worrying about the market for the farmer." I am worrying about it. Russia is supplying thirty per cent of the poultry products to Great Britain.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Is not Russia a lot closer to Great Britain than we are?—A. Yes, and probably there is competition there that we would have to meet.

Q. I would be very glad if you could show us how we could undersell Russia, when it comes to selling things on the British market. Can they not produce things just as cheap as we can, and, being a little closer to the market, just a little better?—A. We have the competition to meet; I do not deny that for one moment.

Q. Are we going to solve the problem for the farmer who is already on the land by increasing production of the stuff that he is trying to find a market for?—A. Yes, sir, I think so. If you can tell me of any first class product to-day that you cannot find a market for, I would like to hear of it.

Discussion followed.

The CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Committee, I am very glad to express to Dean Barton my thanks for his appearance before us.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until Tuesday, May 8, at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, May 8th, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., Mr. J. L. Brown, presiding.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we will come to order. We have with us this morning in response to our invitation the Hon. George Langley of Saskatchewan, who will appear before the Committee and address us in the usual way.

Hon. GEORGE LANGLEY called.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The custom has been for the witness to make a general statement with regard to immigration and then be questioned afterwards.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee: you will let me make my statement in my own way? Yes. Well, I am an English immigrant to Canada. I did not come here when I was a child nor when I was a youth. I was over forty years of age when I came to Canada. I had spent nearly 16 years on the farm in the Old Country and a little more than 24 years in London. In London I followed various avocations—a wage earning man. During the later years I had purchased and run a retail provision business. We had a family of five children when my wife and I made up our minds to sell the business, draw up stakes and come to Canada, which we did. That was in the spring of 1893. We have been farming ever since we came, I think with a vision. The vision was that we might possibly become owners of land in Western Canada. We not only had the vision; we had faith, and we struggled toward its realization with some considerable success. The boys are all married and all farming. I thought I should like to say that so that you would know my attitude toward the Old Country.

When toward the end of last year Premier Gardiner called me over to his office and told me that the Canadian National was promoting a farmers' tour through Great Britain and Denmark and asked me if I would go, I consented and became a member of the party. Perhaps I might outline that there was nothing very much in crossing the water more than there generally is when you take ship at one port and get off at the other. We were practically all strangers to each other. There were two members of the party drawn from each of the provinces excepting Quebec, which I thought and still think was a mistake, because I felt we should have had someone from Quebec. But we did not. Going over the water I made the acquaintance—and I should have thought the journey well worth while if I had only done that one thing—of the Hon. Walter Lea, a member of the Prince Edward Island provincial government. I found him to be a man of much more than usual intelligence, a very companionable fellow, and we got along excellently together. I mention that now, and I shall mention it again.

We should have landed at Liverpool, because that was where our tour was to commence, but for some reason we landed at Plymouth. We spent

[Hon. George Langley.]

Sunday there and went on to Liverpool on Monday and commenced our tour, which was all done in motor buses. We spent a day or two in Liverpool, the same in Manchester and went down to what is known as the West Midlands, Waddington, Stafford, and so forth, and made our first stop after Manchester at Wolverhampton. England comes rather readily to me because I know a little about my own country, England being my own country notwithstanding the fact that I have been in Canada for 35 years. From Liverpool we went to Brierly Hill, and thence to Birmingham; from Birmingham to Oxford, and from Oxford to Windsor, down to the west side of London and went up into London from the west. We spent some days there, when we broke the journey and went to Denmark. After we returned from Denmark we toured the East Midlands, going from London to Cambridge, from Cambridge to Nottingham, from Nottingham to York, and from York to Newcastle, and thence on to Edinburgh where we again made a stay, visiting various parts of Scotland from the Capital. After that we crossed over to Glasgow and visited the various parts of western Scotland from Glasgow, and having done that we re-embarked and came home. That was our itinerary, Mr. Chairman, and it gave us the opportunity of meeting many people at many places. We were received with an effusive welcome everywhere and were entertained, oh, somewhat lavishly.

I have naturally, as an immigrant, always been interested in immigration. As a member of the Saskatchewan Government and an active partisan—for which I hope you will pardon me—I was a consenting party to the bringing into Canada of most of the men whom we call foreigners, who are in the West. I have not a word to say against them. If it had been merely a question of fact that you might have put me in jail for not answering your summons, I should not have come. I have nothing to say against them. We invited them here, and it seems to me it is our duty now they are here to treat them as we would like to be treated if we were in their place. That is my attitude toward the foreign residents, particularly in my own province of Saskatchewan and also practically in every other province. However, I will make the confession that I have been recently a little concerned, not to say alarmed, at the extraordinary disparity in numbers between the immigrants coming from Great Britain and the immigrants coming from other countries. We have discussed this at home at various meetings. I have attended meetings of the veterans, the rank and file of whom take a great interest in this question, and while their leaders are very careful to keep them out of party politics, at the same time they cannot keep men from expressing their opinions. I have always prided myself on the fact that I was taking part in the building of a nation, and I was flattered because I considered we were building a British nation, but I have been forced to the conclusion that you cannot very well build a British nation without British material, and, consequently, I have been concerned at the disparity in the numbers of immigrants from the Old Country and the number of immigrants who are coming from other countries into our Dominion.

Well, the first day we arrived on British soil, after lunch my friend Lea and I thought we would like to go and look at the natives. This was at Plymouth. We took a ride in the motor car that goes around about the city. Mr. Lea is a born Canadian of several generations but of direct English stock and is as much of a Britisher as you could hope any Canadian possibly to be. Being full of our subject, we engaged in conversation with a number of young men who were on the car with us. Now, dealing with the advantages of Canada, I still think that Canada has immense advantages. I told these young fellows what I tell this Committee, that the farming prospects of Western Canada have not been so good for the last twenty years as they are to-day. I am, of course, omitting the years of the war, which were an eruption and cannot be considered, but, speaking of farming as farming, the prospects are brighter and more hope-

[Hon. George Langley.]

ful to-day than they have been at any time during the past twenty years. I told those people to whom we were talking on the car at Plymouth that that was my opinion, and that in my judgment there was as good a prospect to-day in Canada for a man with ambition, perseverance and patience as there was when I came to Canada thirty-five years ago. I told them that it might not take exactly the same form, but the prospects were there. I am a believer—and as I grow in years it gives me pleasure to believe—that our Dominion is on the eve of greater development to-day than she has ever known before.

We talked to these young fellows about that. There were a half a dozen listening to what we had to say, and there we met our first hint of difficulty. A fine young fellow standing, I suppose, five feet ten inches, a man in his early twenties, told us that he had thought of migrating to Canada. But he told us more; he said, "You see I am in a situation where at any rate I am getting a living; there is not much prospect ahead; there is not much to brag about in it, but I am getting a living, and what apparently the people who manage the immigration business for Canada do not understand, is that every man in my position"—I am remembering his words as well as I can—"every man in my position is threatened by from half a dozen to a score of men who are out of employment." He said, "In order to find out information about migrating to Canada I have to attend at a certain named place and I have to attend there at a time when I should be at work. It means I have to go to my governor"—they do not say "boss" over there—"and tell him that I want time off. He wants to know why I want time off and I have to tell him that I am thinking about migrating to Canada, and that means the loss of my position, and I cannot afford to lose it."

That was the first hint of trouble which we had in connection with it. Friend Lea and myself cogitated over it and talked about it. After we got to Liverpool I made the acquaintance of men I had known in Saskatchewan who were engaged as immigration workers. You see, I am something of a democrat, and the men who had worked with me and knew me at home very naturally came and talked to me about these things. There was a feeling amongst the immigration workers of extreme pessimism. They said they could not make any headway; there was no result to their labours. We treasured these things up as we went about from place to place. When we got to Birmingham I met others whom I had known in Saskatchewan who were also engaged in immigration work. I am not mentioning names, although I can give them, because these men are also in positions they do not want to lose. One man in Birmingham, an old acquaintance, said, "I am comparatively new, Mr. Langley, to this work and perhaps that is the reason why it is somewhat discouraging." I said, "What is there discouraging about it?" calling him by his military title, as he has one. He said, "The discouraging thing about it is that there is no popular opinion in favour of immigration to Canada, of which we can take advantage."

Well, we went on, and the immigration question rested from Birmingham until we got to London. There we met more officials. We visited the central office of the Canadian National Railways—they were promoting the tour—and we visited Canada House and had a talk with the Canadian High Commissioner who, to be perfectly fair to him, was not unwilling to discuss the matter—and if I am mistaken I apologize to him—but he discussed it apologetically. He admitted they were not getting the results they were hoping for, but made certain excuses which evidently were satisfactory to him, although they did not appear very satisfactory to me. We had interviews with members of the Old Country department of Agriculture and again discussed immigration, but we did not get very much farther than that.

I think now I must revert a little, as I want to deal with Cambridge, because there I think I got light. When we got to Edinburgh another old acquaintance of mine from Saskatchewan came to the hotel to see me and he came with a very definite story. He said, "I see by the paper, Mr. Langley, that you

are a member of this party, and I knew perfectly well that whomever I could not talk to I could talk to you." Again I could give you the name, but I will not, because this man is in a position there which he values. I said, "What is the trouble?" and he said, "Well, it is difficult to say," I said, "how do you do your work?" and he said, "We advertise meetings where the people are getting together at fairs and that sort of thing, and I go and hold the meeting and address the people." I said, "Do you have good meetings?" and he said, "Always good meetings." I knew this man in Canada as a newspaper writer at one time, as the manager of a considerable estate at another, and as a farmer on another occasion, a really capable Scotsman, a tall man with a good presence and good figure. I said, "Do you get any response at your meetings?" and he said, "Yes, oh yes; people listen, are interested, come to see me afterwards and I make arrangements in connection with them as to what they are to do in order to be able to emigrate to Canada. Then I go away to my next meeting and when I come back my work is undone. I am like a fisherman who is getting no end of good bites but who is not able to land his fish." I said, "Well, that is rather hard." And then in a moment of outburst he said, "Mr. Langley, we are fighting against an invisible enemy." I paid more attention to this man, because of my knowledge of him, than I had to anybody else.

Now, I want to go back to Cambridge. At Cambridge we were entertained at the University. The Professors were good to us, the cereal professor told us all about grain, although I think he did not tell some of us anything we did not know. One professor was particularly interested in immigration, and I think I may mention his name. It was Professor Vemm, a comparatively young man. His work consisted somewhat in over-seas work. We talked about Canada and about his prospects, and I bore witness, as I have to this Committee, of my opinion as to the future of Canada and after considerable interchange of opinions the professor confronted me with this question. He said, "Mr. Langley, you are here, so the papers say, as a representative of the Saskatchewan government?" I said, "Yes." He said, "Do you know the members of that government?" I said, "Yes, every one of them." He said, "Do you know the members of the Federal Government at all?" I said, "Yes, two of them were formerly my colleagues when I was a member of the Saskatchewan Government and there are two members whom I remembered,—" two gentlemen who are sitting here in front of me to-day—"with whom I had a casual acquaintance, and who were very friendly at any rate." He said, "Will you give me a straight answer to a straight question?" I said, "I will try; what is the question?" He said, "Knowing these men as you do, do they really want immigrants from the Mother Country?" I answered him without any hesitation, and I said, "Knowing the men as I do I am quite sure they do want immigrants from England and Scotland." And he said, "Well, all I can say is that they are the most unfortunate people who ever existed." I said, "Why so?" And he said, "Because they have a set of regulations and a large number of officials who are doing more to prevent emigration from Great Britain than anything else in the world." The professor was silent for a moment, and a gentleman who was with me, and who had been carrying on the conversation with me said, "Let me tell you that the bringing of Canadian doctors into Great Britain has completely antagonized the medical men of our country and it has created an atmosphere of antagonism to immigration to Canada that is all over this country from one end to the other." And I thought of that statement when my friend at Edinburgh told me that we were fighting an invisible enemy. Sometimes I think, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that we do not appreciate these things as we should. There is an old saying that you can occasionally find out where the boot pinches by putting the shoe on

your own foot, and curiously enough we had an instance not a month ago right in our Dominion. A very eminent flyer from the United States was unfortunately left in our hospitals in Quebec and appeared, from newspaper reports, to be fighting a losing battle for existence. His countrymen were alarmed and the Rockefeller Institute association with others sent the most prominent airman in the United States, Colonel Lindberg, with what they hoped would be helpful assistance in saving the life of the threatened flyer, and all of you know what happened. Minister David of the Provincial Government of Quebec burst out in wrath, and the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Taschereau, joined in the effort. They wanted to know whether America thought that Quebec was a barbarous country. Well, according to my informant at Cambridge, that is what the medical men of Great Britain want to know; that is what they want to know. I know it will be said—and I recognize it—that there is no public evidence of this condition of things. Well, my countrymen are a proud people. They have reason to be proud. Their medical men are of a proud profession, and they have reason to be proud. They and their institutions, hospitals and so forth, stand in the forefront of the old civilization as capable and efficient men, and according to my informant—and Professor Vemm endorsed it—they feel that they have not been fairly treated by our people, and for that reason this public opinion has been created, an opinion of antagonism against emigration to our Dominion. There is in reality the best evidence of all, and that evidence is that you cannot get immigrants. I have, through the public press, read the evidence that has been given before this Committee by the Presidents of the two great transportation companies and the two men who are at the head of the immigration efforts of those two companies, Doctor Black and Colonel Dennis. Doctor Black told you that it cost so much more to get immigrants from the Old Country than it does to get them from elsewhere. Why, of course it does. Under the circumstances that is quite unavoidable. Colonel Dennis told you that this year they are getting less immigrants than ever, and that is quite true. Of course they are. There have been not only Canadian doctors over there, but if I am correctly informed, those doctors are stationed in the interior of the countries—some of them—anyway—

Hon. Mr. FORKE: No.

The WITNESS: Well, then I have been mis-informed. I was not sure about that.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Well, you would have let it go if there had been no one here to catch it up.

The WITNESS: Be that as it may, the doctors are there. Good Lord, they went over; they must be there. That is what I was forced to learn. It is not pleasant to say these things, Mr. Chairman, because in giving this evidence I am a supporter of the present Government. I helped to elect Mr. Forke; he knows I did. I voted for the Liberal member from my own constituency of Regina. I would not have said these things but for the fact that we are confronted with a blockade, and it is only by recognizing facts that the blockade can be removed. I will make a suggestion. I think instead of displacing Old Country doctors we should use them. We should use them with care. For instance, in my insurance policy my people send me periodically a paper asking me to go to a doctor in my own district and get him to examine me and fill in the paper. It is rather an elaborate affair. Have you ever been through it, Mr. Chairman? Plenty of these other people have. Now, they do not send their doctor down, because I think if they did I would not go to him; I simply would not go to him. I would say, "No, there are doctors in Regina in whom I have confidence, and if you want a report I will go to them." I think we should have

[Hon. George Langley.]

papers which should be filled in with those items which are necessary to insure a good immigrant, and an immigrant contemplating coming to Canada should be allowed to go to his own doctor. Check up the information at the seaboard if you like, but it would not require an army of doctors to check it up. I am still of the opinion, with great deference to the authorities that we could get just as reliable doctors to check these things up in Great Britain as we can send over from this Dominion. That is how I feel about it. I expressed these thoughts to friends at home—I mean in the West. I speak of the Old Country as home, and then I speak of Regina as home. I am a kind of cosmopolitan man and have homes everywhere. The people to whom I spoke thought I should come down and say these things to this Committee, and so I have come here. I would much rather have come and praised my old political friend, Mr. Forke; I would much rather have come and praised him to the skies than to come and give the evidence I have given this morning.

Now that is practically what I have to say to the Committee and I hope I have said it in a manner that has conveyed my meaning to every member. We had a rare opportunity of seeing and hearing and examining, and it seemed to me I owed the duty to this Committee—to you, sir, as its Chairman—to come here and say what had been brought under my notice while I was travelling through Great Britain from one end to the other. You cannot talk to an immigration worker anywhere who will speak hopefully and optimistically. You cannot find them. They are in a condition of practical despair, because as my friend in Scotland, in Edinburgh, said to me: “Mr. Langley, there is good work to be done here, there are lots of material to make the best immigrants that you could hope for for the Dominion, but,” he said, “I am in a worse condition than a man with his hands tied.” There now, I think I have conveyed my idea to the Committee.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Mr. Langley, before you conclude, is that the only objection to the present scheme, the medical inspection by Canadian doctors? Did you find that all the other regulations were acceptable or are there others to which you have objection? What the Committee would like to get from you, who have been over there recently, is a very frank statement; it does not matter about the Government being criticized or not; what the Committee want to have is, and our regulations too onerous, in the Old Country, and more particularly is the assisted passage having a deterrent effect on those who cannot comply with the requirements of the assisted passage?—A. You have reference to the family passage?

Q. Yes.—A. Yes.

Q. Or any assisted passage?—A. Any assisted passage.

Q. Is the fact that certain people who measure up to the requirements of the assisted passage, having a deterrent effect upon those who otherwise would pay their own passage in coming to the country?—A. So far as the family arrangement is concerned, Mr. Chairman, the evidence I got in reference to it was that it was about all over; and everybody was glad it was.

Q. That is what I would like to get from you. For what reason?—A. They were glad it was because it was defeating them to a very considerable extent from getting out more desirable immigration material.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Will you state that again, please? I could not hear you.—A. The family arrangement, you understand that, sir?

Hon. Mr. STEWART: That is the three thousand family scheme.

[Hon. George Langley.]

The WITNESS: Yes. The family arrangement was nearly through, and they were glad it was, because that arrangement was having a deterring effect so far as immigration was concerned, in preventing them getting at men who were more desirable as immigration material, having particular reference to the young single man. Have I answered you fairly?

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Would you go as far, Mr. Langley, as to say that from the evidence and from the experience that you have had in the Old Country, you would not think it desirable to continue a scheme of that kind?—A. I would say that most emphatically, most emphatically. You see, I took a family over myself, gentlemen. We did not take much money with us; there was my wife and myself, four boys and a girl. And when we got over there was precious little money left after paying the passage. But we were thrown, so to speak, on our own resources. We stuck to the job, and while I am not going to compete in wealth with either of the Ministers—

Q. I take exception to that— A. At the same time we get three meals a day, as my appearance bears witness.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Mr. Langley, you heard the evidence of Dr. Black, who took exactly the opposite view to yours. He would have assisted the families but allowed the single people to come paying their own passage.—A. I did not think I had spoken on that line, Mr. Chairman. I want to make myself perfectly clear to the Committee and especially to the Minister. I think there is one direction, Mr. Chairman, in which the Government ought to move and could move, and that is not by paying a passage but by getting a lower passage price.

Q. We have tried that.—A. For single men. You need not trouble about the women. If we get the men here the women will come all right.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Mr. Langley, the assisted passage or the reduced passage which is now in effect, applies only to agricultural workers. Is that having a deterrent effect upon general immigration? I mean the man who cannot take advantage of that but would come here as an artisan, against whom there are no restrictions except the additional passage which he must pay. What opinions have you formed about that?—A. When you bear in mind that there are only six and a half per cent of the workers in Great Britain that are actually working on the land—only six and a half per cent—the idea of expecting enlarged immigration results from agricultural workers in Great Britain is the varied dream.

Q. You mean employed on the farms themselves?—A. Yes. As a matter of fact, the farm workers in Great Britain are better off to-day than they ever were. Their service is of value. Their employers will not let them come if they can help it, and they can offer very good terms, and they are offering very good terms. And that brings me to another point. I can, in my own district, and other districts are the same, put my hands on men who have made farming a success, but who never knew a thing about farming until they came to Canada.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Do you know any other business, outside of farming, of which a little knowledge is rather detrimental than otherwise?—A. Oh, I know the old adage, "a little learning is a dangerous thing", but as a matter of fact you have to bear in mind that farming is an experimental science. We start from the bottom upwards. At least that is how I started. And while at times we stood still and rested and figured out, still the next start was upward again. And nearly

[Hon. George Langley.]

all the men who have come prominently before the public as exceptional farmers, who have earned prizes for producing for exhibition farm products, have been men in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta especially, who previous to their farming in Canada never had anything to do with farming. Why, there is half the men working in offices in the city of Ottawa to-day who would be a great deal better off if they would come out west and go on the farm. And there is no reason in the world why they should not make a great success. No reason in the world.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Mr. Langley, it has been stated in the Committee that men of say twenty-five or around there, without farm experience in the Old Country, do not possess the qualities to become successful farmers in Canada, that are possessed by men of similar attainment who come from the Continent of Europe. Do you believe that?—A. I have seen that statement. You cannot prevent some men talking foolishly, you know, sir.

Q. That has been said before this Committee.—A. Yes, I know, but it is all moonshine. There are other qualities besides handling a fork that make a good farmer. For instance, a man was in my house at Regina not a week ago, and by the way, he is an east country farmer, an Ontario man. He said: "You know Mr. Langley, I made a success of farming." I said, "Yes, I understand that, Mr. Richardson." He said, "I farm two sections of land down here south of Regina and I have never had a man that I could put any reliance on until I got a young Englishman." Now these are qualities that make satisfactory farmers. On my own farm, and with my four sons, we farm between three and four thousand acres of land—I am ashamed to confess it, gentlemen, because we ought to have half a city on that quantity of land,—but we engaged the foreigners to help us; not men who could not talk English, because there are many of them of the second generation. I do not myself do much farming now, as you gentlemen can easily understand. A man who is nearer eighty than seventy does not want to do much farming. But I spoke to my son about a man we have had for, I think, eleven years. I said, "Frank, if I were you I would get rid of Lewis." I said, "He is too slow for everything." "Well, dad," he said, "that is all right, but," he said, "now, I occasionally leave the farm." We keep a cottage at the lake and we go up there to spend some time in the summer. He said, "when I go away I leave everything in Lewis' hands, and I come home when the holiday is over and everything is taken just the same care of as though I had been there myself." Now, that is the advantage of Old Country farmers, and those are the men we want in Western Canada. I have known a good many of the so-called alien foreign element that are not much very more willing to work than the rest of men. No, I do not believe it; I do not believe a word of it; and I do not care where you bring them from. You may bring them from the Germans and they are good workers. One dare say a quiet word for the German now. The war has been over ten years. And the Mennonites. I lived in a Mennonite district for eight or ten years. I went there with all an Englishman's prejudices against them, but they are fine people, Mr. Chairman. I learned to look to my neighbours for the good qualities in them, and you would be surprised what a lot of good qualities I found in those Mennonite people. But I am not going to forget my own countrymen, and especially Scotsmen—the Minister would never forgive me if I did.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: On my farm I have four men there, and they are all Canadians; English born Canadians.

The WITNESS: What are we to understand by that? Well, I only want to repeat what I said before, Mr. Chairman: we are building a British nation. If we are not we ought to be. And as for the second generation of mid-Euro-

[Hon. George Langley.]

peans, they may learn our language, they do, and are very apt at it; but they are only in a very small degree British. I am a Britisher and Canada is one in the British Commonwealth of Nations, and I do not think that we should ever forget it, Mr. Chairman. Now, would anybody else like to ask me anything?

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Mr. Langley, I am very well satisfied, I may say, with the reply you gave me with respect to the family scheme. But as you know, sir, this Committee is trying to discover where there are difficulties that may be remedied in connection with our British immigration. That is one of the things we must give very careful attention to, and what I would like to know is this: that in our assisted passage scheme for the young men and the young women—the boys and girls come free and we have no difficulty about them—is that having a deterrent effect and preventing other people who cannot qualify as agricultural workers? They must qualify as agricultural workers before ordinarily speaking they can get a passage. Now, there must be a great number of other people, who are desirous of coming, outside of that class. Does the fact, that we are giving these assisted passages have a deterrent effect upon other classes because they have to pay their full passage? That is what I would like to get your opinion on?—A. Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, whatever assistance is given should be given to all alike.

Q. Irrespective of occupation?—A. Irrespective of occupation, it should be given to all alike. So long as they are men with sound minds, healthy minds in sound and healthy bodies, the question of their occupation is a figment, and the sooner you gentlemen who are authorities on this matter forget it, the better it will be for yourselves and everybody else. What I want to emphasize more than anything is that you have to clear away this antagonism in the Old Country towards emigration to Canada. Unless you clear that away your hands are tied all the time.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Mr. Langley, we got about fifty thousand British people, about twenty thousand more than Australia got last year. Is there any trouble about British people going to Australia?—A. Well, I know this. I can only speak as a reader of information that comes to me; that the proportion of British compared with others that go to Australia—oh, well, we don't compare ourselves with them at all. You know we don't.

Q. If you get my figures, there were about thirty thousand or more went to Australia, and we got fifty thousand; about twenty thousand more people. It is the popular idea that Australia is getting more people than Canada, but such is not the fact. I think we have a better country than Australia. And Australia, apparently, is not having better success in getting British people than we are. Did you find any prejudice against Australia in Great Britain?—A. No, we did not find prejudice there. You mentioned it or I would have mentioned it, Mr. Chairman. Australia does not compare with Canada.

Q. We will admit that.—A. Australia is a big wilderness. Men who have been there a lifetime can get lost in their own country; whereas we have a garden here, sir.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. I would like to ask, is it not the fact that the ratio of emigration to Australia, compared to other countries, from Britain, is greater than to Canada. There was a witness here the other day, who made that statement as evidence.—A. Oh, well, every member of this Committee knows what you say is true.

[Hon. George Langley.]

Q. I quite agree with you in that, that more immigrants come to Canada than go to Australia from England, but the number is not in comparison with those from foreign countries?—A. Oh, no, every member of the Committee knows that.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Mr. Langley, we have had before this Committee some suggestions, constructive in their nature, to the effect that it is necessary and in fact vital, under present conditions, that the maximum assistance should be given to intending British settlers in order to settle them on the land, provide them with means for building a house and some of the instruments for cultivation and perhaps a cow or two and to settle them in a home when they come. That suggestion has been made, I think, by representatives here and endorsed by the representatives of the C.P.R. and the C.N.R. and by other gentlemen. Can you give us any suggestions along that line, as to the advisability of giving financial assistance to enable intending settlers to actually settle on the land?—A. Mr. Chairman, that question opens up a wide consideration. There are two classes in the Old Country at present. I do not now refer to social classes. There is a large number of unemployed. If you are going to bring people from the ranks of the unemployed, Mr. Chairman, the more assistance you can give to them the better. I will give you the reasons. I do not know how many of you gentlemen have ever been wage-earners out of work. It was my experience, Mr. Chairman, that in London as a young man I was a wage-earner out of work. I went around for weeks trying to get work and could not. I want to say this, recalling that experience, gentlemen: I do not know anything that destroys a man's confidence in himself more than being in that position. That is why I almost deprecate the idea of drawing immigrants from the ranks of the unemployed. They lack the first quality of a good immigrant, and that quality is self-reliance. But if you will bring them over, the more help you can give them the better.

Q. May I ask in that connection, following the discussions before this Committee; the idea which I have obtained is that the employment in the West of ordinary farm workers is seasonal. We know large numbers of immigrants are required by the farmers who now own and operate their farms; but that there is an opportunity of creating, not new settlements, but of settling immigrants. Even though they were far from those who were unemployed, there is a body of men who are employed who would be prepared to come to this country if they had financial assistance to enable them to settle, to have a house, to live over the first year until they get down to active agricultural work. Is there a class like that of desirable settlers who could be obtained if moderate financial assistance were afforded them?—A. Well, the men who want to come but who want to be bribed to come to this country, would not be very much good to us when they get here.

Q. Do you regard assistance in the way of settling people on the land, in acquiring the land and implements, as a bribe?—A. Yes, in a measure it is. Mr. Chairman, I have learned this: you see I have been thirty years at this game; when a man's animals and his house are his own and he has had to provide them, he will take a care of them that he will never take care of those things when they are not his own.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Mr. Langley, in your opinion would we get a better type of immigrants if we did away with assisted passages altogether?—A. Well, I have expressed the idea, Mr. Chairman, that I think the passage fare is too high. It is more than double what it was when I came over. And money is not worth so much now as it was then.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: Nearly three times.

[Hon. George Langley.]

The WITNESS: Yes. Now if the Government can do something to make the fares over here more reasonable, without its taking the charitable terms such as this gentleman mentioned—because after all that is charity you know.

By Mr. Cahon:

Q. No more than agricultural loans are charities.—A. No; for instance, our Government in Saskatchewan has loaned some nine million dollars to farmers. There is no charity in that. They have never lost a dollar. Not one dollar. No, no, we must not juggle with words; charity is charity.

Q. I do not wish to prolong the discussion about that, but I would like a clear understanding of it. The successful method mentioned by the Canadian Pacific representative, and endorsed by the C.N.R. representative, was that for the purpose of enabling settlers to acquire land, advances were made which were a mortgage upon the land. It was not money given as charity, but money loaned as a fair business undertaking, and one gentleman, Mr. Magrath I think it was, suggested that at least eighty, or eighty-five or more per cent of that credit would be absolutely guaranteed by reasonable and effective security?—A. Yes, well, I have not anything to say against that. I will not use the word charity. I have nothing to say against any assistance you can give men of that kind coming in to the country, but in my judgment they will not make the best settlers and they will not make the best Canadians.

Q. One more question, because I am simply trying, in my own mind, to ascertain the facts from a gentleman of your experience. The settlers whom you would induce to come here and who have not funds sufficient to buy land, would only find employment as farm labourers, would they not under present conditions? And secondly, is the demand for farm labourers sufficient, the wages paid the farm labourers and the continuity of employment sufficient, to induce them to come into this country?—A. I believe the inducements are sufficient. I have mentioned my own servant, a good servant. I remember when we were raising the Victory Loan. My neighbour was collecting and he came to see me and I took up a moderate amount of the loan as most good Canadian did. He said, "well, you have not been so good to me as I expected you would be." "Well," I said, "Good gracious, Mr. Richard, did you expect I was going to borrow money to buy Victory bonds?" "Well, no," he said, "not quite that." I said, "Have you tried my hired men." We had two then. He said, "the hired men?" "Will they take up Victory bonds?" "Well," I said, "go and try them." This was back in 1918. One of those men has been with me ever since, and he has had his wages regularly and to the consternation of this man he took up a thousand dollar bond.

Q. I can assume that to be so, but is there a sufficient demand for farm help of that kind in the prairie provinces so that you need a much larger immigration from Great Britain?—A. I believe there is, sir. For instance, as I have told the Committee just now, the farming prospect is brighter than it has been for many years past. When I say that I want you gentlemen to understand what I mean by the farm prospect. A farmer's profit is the margin that he has left after the cost of production has been paid. And from this cause: I do not want to say anything that will flatter my friends of the Pool. —I see some of them here present—but the margin over the cost of production is three or four times to-day what it was for years, even before the war. I will give you an illustration to show you what it means. I have a very friendly acquaintance with Mr. Johnston who was formerly a member of the House of Commons. He got in to some stupid trouble, as some of you will remember. Mr. Johnston and I meet and do some work together on a committee and I recommended to him an Englishman last harvest time. He said he wanted

[Hon. George Langley.]

a man. I said I did not think the man had had much experience if any at farming, but that I liked his appearance and he looked willing. So I brought them together and he engaged him. When he got into the harvest work the Englishman took his place with the others and when the harvest and threshing were over my friend spoke to the man in this way. He said, "really I don't know that I want a man but you seem a decent fellow and I feel we can trust you and it will give the wife and I and the children a little more liberty if you will stay with me during the winter, and I will give you so and so." Not a summer wage, but he had the best of living and a wage, I do not know what it was, some twenty-five dollars or thirty dollars a month. And he stayed with him all winter. Now there will be opportunities of that kind in hundreds and thousands of cases.

Q. Mr. Langley, I am simply calling your attention to this: I have listened to the evidence given to this Committee and I know something about farming; I have owned a large farm myself and therefore I am very much interested. But the evidence as I understand it, given before this Committee, is that during the winter season Winnipeg has thousands of unemployed immigrants coming from the farms into the city who become a burden upon the people of that city. In a lesser degree that applies to Regina, Edmonton and other western cities. Now, I would like to know from your experience, not from dealing with your own farm help, because evidently you feel that your farm help is in a very satisfactory condition—A. Well, I am not any better than my neighbours.

Q. I am disposed to think that you are from the evidence given before this Committee. Are there openings in the provinces of the Middle West for say twenty thousand more British immigrants than we are now receiving? Are there openings for those men as farm helpers, with a clear prospect of continuous employment during the twelve months of the year, even although the wage may be less during the winter months?—A. Yes, I still say there is. Now, on the question of these large numbers of unemployed, I do not know about Winnipeg; I am not a Manitoba man. I do know this: I was Minister of Municipal Affairs in 1913. Before the war. We were forced to come to the help of our municipalities, Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and the smaller ones, to assist with the unemployed. We have never been called upon since then as a Provincial Government to do anything of the kind.

Q. That is very good, but this further suggestion has been made before the Committee: that prior to the war large railway construction was being carried on in the west, giving employment for a part of the year to large numbers of men who could avail themselves of that sort of employment when the agricultural demand was diminished; while at the present time construction in the same large way is not going on; with the result—this is my impression from the evidence—that thousands of men, immigrants, are out of employment during the winter season, who came out with the earnest intention of going on the farms, but they were employed during a certain part of the year and then they were told they were not required and they went to the cities and towns. Is that not the case? I would like to know it very clearly from you.—A. It certainly is not the case in Saskatchewan. Perhaps one reason for it, Mr. Chairman, is that in Saskatchewan our people have gone more largely into cattle raising, and the cattle have to be fed in the winter, you know, so that in fact there is more work attached to having cattle in the winter than there is in the summer. In the summer we turn them out into the pastures and they are very little trouble, but in the winter they have to be fed indoors and that may be one reason why there is more continuous employment for farm help on the farms in the winter time. But we certainly have had no such difficulty to assist the urban municipalities as we had in 1913.

Q. I have gathered the impression from some of the evidence that I heard before the Committee that the farmers of the Middle West who have succeeded are rather averse to the rapid development of agriculture in those districts, the products of which would come into competition more or less with their own products. Now, I do not mean to say that that has been stressed too much, but at least I have heard some reflections of that sort before this Committee.—A. I am glad you have mentioned it, sir. In the Middle West we are not truck farmers. In Saskatchewan we are not truck farmers. We have not cities large enough to make truck farming a possibility. You understand me, of course, when I use those terms? We are grain farmers, or cattle raisers, and our surplus is sold abroad. The price is made abroad, even for what we sell at home. So that there is no question in the world, and I cannot understand anyone unless he is a very poor minded man who thinks that we are overstocking the world with produce. You see the newspapers, sir, do you not?

Q. I read them occasionally.—A. And the market report of the price of wheat is that it is between \$1.60 and \$1.70 a bushel. We evidently have not overstocked the market and lowered the price by overstocking it. Now, we have learned the secret of marketing, while you gentlemen have been making laws, we, who have not had that occupation, have been learning the secret of marketing and we are doing it pretty effectively. Well, that is what the Old Country people say, anyway. They say our grain is too dear. And the cause of it—this is what they told me when I was there—is this pool of yours. My friend over there said, “what does that pool of yours do?” “Oh,” I said, “we use pools in our country for other purposes than bathing”.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Mr. Langley, one of the statements stressed by the two representatives of the railways was that in bringing out English families who desire to come out together, their work would be greatly facilitated if assistance were given in the construction of cottages on the farms for the hired help. I think Mr. Black mentioned, if I remember correctly, that he had about twelve hundred available and that if money were put into the construction of cottages on the farms, either owned by the farmer or on land purchased by the family, there might be an assurance of a home to put these families in when they came to seek employment. He stressed that very considerably upon the attention of the Committee. What would your opinion be about that?—A. I have not a word, Mr. Chairman, to say against providing a man with a warm cottage for the winter time in our country. I have spent thirty-five winters there and I know a warm cottage is very desirable. I have not a word to say against it, but I would not dwell on that as a part of an immigration movement. The more you molly-coddle immigrants, the less desirable they are as settlers. Have I answered you, Mr. Minister?

Q. Yes, I just wanted your opinion.—A. That is my opinion, the less desirable they are as settlers.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Mr. Langley, may I get your opinion in regard to another matter? You spoke of the effect of our present medical examination. Do you think it advisable to require intending immigrants to get two certificates or two references, one of which is from the man's employer? Do you think that advisable, or that it has a deterrent effect? And secondly, do you think it has a deterrent effect that the civil examination and the medical examination should be at different times and probably at different places?—A. I will answer the last question first. A medical examination is a peculiar thing; a man or a woman would ten times rather go to their own doctor to be medically examined than to go to a stranger. And the first question, what was it?

[Hon. George Langley.]

Q. It was in regard to the fact that the intending immigrant coming to Canada for land settlement requires two references, one of which must be from his employer. If he goes to Australia I think the conditions are much easier in that regard?—A. The Old Countryman is nearly as human as the Canadian, you know? Sometimes if he wanted to get rid of a party he would give half a dozen references. We in the West do not pay very much attention to references.

Q. No, but he must get the references in order to qualify as an immigrant to come out and work on the farm, under the assisted passage. He must present that and not only must he be medically and physically fit, not only must he pass the medical examination and the civil examination, but he does not even then qualify to come to Canada unless he presents also two references, one of which must be from his present employer.—A. Yes, I know. Mr. Chairman, I will try to make myself clear. You see, I was an agricultural worker; born on a farm. To put it plainly, my father was an agricultural labourer. He never was ashamed of it. I never was ashamed of it. We were accustomed to all this reference business. If your man or your woman has been free from criminal blemish, if nothing of that kind can be brought against them and they are healthy, I would not pay very much attention to that reference business.

Q. But would he perhaps jeopardize his job with his present employer, if obliged to go to him to get a reference to comply with this regulation?—A. Why, of course he would.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Are you satisfied that the examination of intending emigrants should take place in the Old Country rather than in Canada?—A. Yes, certainly. What is the use of examining a man medically after having carried him for thousands of miles.

Q. You think that is the proper procedure in your opinion?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. You say that the Old Country doctors have taken exception to the Canadian doctors doing examinations alone in the Old Country?—A. They have.

Q. What would you suggest?—A. I would say, use them wherever you can.

Q. Do you think that all the antagonism that has been created in regard to immigrants coming to Canada could be dispelled if some English or Scotch doctors were also made part of those who were medical examiners?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. In your opinion, would it be a proper thing to make a combination of both, that some medical men in the Old Country should be part of the Board, in connection with Canadian doctors?—A. I would not have a Canadian doctor examined for Canada alone, examining a man that was coming to Canada, under any circumstances.

Q. What is your reason for that?—A. You want to clear away the objection that does exist now. If the Minister could forget that he is a Minister, and if the Government could undertake to send Mr. Forke over there incognito, and let him move among the people as I have moved among them, when he came back he would revolutionize this whole Immigration policy.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: We have had men moving about among them, and we have had their evidence.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Do you think there is a tendency among English doctors, when examining their own patients, to be a little lenient and say "Well, you are not very well, you are not very healthy, a trip across the ocean will do you good"?—A. I have not had much to do with doctors in the Old Country, except for family reasons, and I have never found them of that character.

Q. Was not that a reason why a great many of our men were turned back, when we had only the Roster Doctors?—A. If the examination was not sufficiently thorough by the Old Country doctors, provide them with definite questions.

Q. Why do you think it would be more thorough now?—A. You heard what I suggested, that we would do better with definite questions with definite answers, such as we have to consider in connection with our insurance policies. If they went with them and had them properly filled in, I am persuaded that forty-nine Old Country doctors out of fifty would do the right thing.

Q. That is what we had before, but the family physicians, we found, in certain cases were inclined to be a little lenient and say, "You are not very strong, take a trip across the Atlantic to Canada and you will be all right"?—A. I would not take that as a criterion of the average Old Country doctor.

Q. Do you not think that if we have Old Country doctors we should have Canadian doctors too?—A. I do not think there would be any objection at all to their acting together.

By Mr. Pettit:

Q. Would not diversified farming in the West take up the present unemployment, and would not diversified farming create more continuous employment?—A. I think I caught the question, Mr. Chairman. There is a good deal of nonsense talked in the world about a lot of things. I do not think there is more nonsense talked anywhere than there is about diversified farming. You have to bear in mind that our western country is extremely extensive, and our western plains, the best wheat growing sections of our country, are not suitable for keeping large quantities of cattle, for this reason, that if you have a crop failure your feed fails, and you are just as short of taking care of your stock as you are of grain to ship out. As a matter of fact, compared with population, we have more cattle in Saskatchewan, and it is true of Manitoba and Alberta also, than you have in Ontario. You keep talking about diversified farming as though you could not find a cow on a western farm, and as though a western farmer would not know a cow if he saw it. But that is all nonsense.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. During your address you pointed out that many of the most successful farmers in the West were British immigrants of little or no practical experience?—A. Exactly.

Q. Would you then suggest that in assisting these people, we should assist them and then ask them to engage in agriculture after they come here so that they could take advantage of it to the same extent as we extend it to agricultural labourers in the Old Country. I believe you think that out of the small percentage of British people who are agricultural labourers we cannot get many from that source; would you suggest that we take these other people, and when they come to Canada compel them to engage in agriculture?—A. Well, this compelling them to engage in agriculture, I have seen that; I have seen girls who came over to be house help, domestics—and there are more ways than one to kill a cat. These provisions are easily subverted, and are very often subverted. I would treat them all alike.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. I would like to ask one more question, sir. You have, I understand, had a very long experience in the administration of provincial affairs in Saskatchewan?—A. Yes.

Q. I have listened here to evidence in regard to the C.N.R., the C.P.R., a great number of colonization associations, and a number of religious associations engaged in immigration work, and it seemed to me that there was rather

[Hon. George Langley.]

a lack of co-operation; could you suggest, from your experience, some way of securing the co-operation of the Provincial Governments with the Federal Government, some effective method of association and co-operation among those bodies, which would assist in carrying out in a large way the emigration of people from Great Britain to Canada?—A. The getting of the settlers should be entirely a Federal work.

Q. Why?—A. Because they have a common interest in the whole of Canada. The settling of the men when they arrive in the provinces should be the work of the Provincial Governments. You men from Ottawa, settling men in Alberta and Saskatchewan, are too far from the centre of authority, Mr. Chairman. The matter should be undertaken by the Provincial Government, and if there is necessary an arrangement of finances, that arrangement should be made.

Q. Has there been any effective co-operation to that end up to date, and if not, how could it be improved?—A. Well, Mr. Chairman, do we not continually fail and then improve?

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. Do we not continually fail, and then improve? The very fact that in the past there has not been this desideratum asked for is no reason why there should not be in the future, is there?

Q. From your knowledge of the governments of the central provinces, would they co-operate in that way with the Federal Government, to carry out that work?—A. Take my own province—I do not want to go outside of that, because I might get into trouble—but in our own province the last appointed Minister has been given a title that has never been given before to any member of our government; his title is Minister of Immigration. There is proof positive that they are anxious to co-operate with the Federal authorities.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Mr. Langley, when you were a member of the Saskatchewan Government, was the Provincial Government at that time very anxious to engage in any immigration work or colonization work?—A. Well, Mr. Chairman, you see at the time I was there we were somewhat new, from the arrangement that we made in regard to land with the Federal Government; you know we were. They kept our land on the understanding that they would undertake to settle it up. Here is Mr. Totzke; he was a member of the Assembly at the time I was, and he knows that what I am saying is right.

I believe, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that there is a sincere desire on the part of the Government of Saskatchewan to co-operate with you in connection with Old Country Immigration and its settlement.

Q. I think there is, because there has been, I believe, a vast improvement since your time?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Would that co-operation involve the direction and superintendence of immigration by the Federal Government, and the superintendence of settlement and colonization by the Provincial Governments, with the Federal Government acting in co-operation?—A. I think it would involve that very largely. The procuring of settlers would be upon the Federal authorities, that is their business, and, the arrangement of their settlement would be upon the provincial authorities.

Q. That is the basis of co-operation between the two bodies you would suggest?—A. The basis of co-operation between the two parties.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Mr. Langley, you have been over a great deal of Saskatchewan; is there a great quantity of free, good agricultural land within reasonable distance of a railway, reasonably suitable for homesteading purposes?—A. There is quite a lot.

[Hon. George Langley.]

Q. In what part of the country?—A. North of the C.P.R. main line, and south of the Swift Current line there is considerable settlement to be made there.

Q. Is that not very dry land?—A. It is dry sometimes.

Hon. Mr. STEWART: They would not let me open that up this year.

Q. Would you call that good agricultural land?—A. It could be farmed profitably. That is what I call good agricultural land. It is not as good as I have got; I am willing to make that admission. It is not as good land as I have got, but it is land that can be farmed profitably.

Q. With good climatic conditions?—A. Under good climatic conditions. As a matter of fact, the Provincial Government does want a little spurring up. You can easily spur them. Make a complete list of unoccupied and uncultivated lands. I do not think they have a list of that kind, but they should have it.

Q. Do you not think we should have a soil survey of that part of the country, to see what kinds of land we have?—A. Yes. There is one thing I should like to say. I am speaking to Federal members now. Do not try to push work onto the Provincial House that you would not want pushed on to you if you were a member of the Provincial House.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. I think you said there is less call for unemployment assistance now than before the war?—A. Yes.

Q. You are speaking for the Province of Saskatchewan?—A. Yes.

Q. It didn't strike me that that left a true impression of the situation. Each fall there is a demand for 20,000, 30,000 or 40,000 extra men to take off the harvest in the Prairie Provinces, that is, in addition to those who are considered settlers engaged for the whole summer. What proportion of those 20,000, 30,000 or 40,000 would you say would have a fair chance of getting employment during the winter?—A. I was reading—this is one of the inconveniences of having two suits of clothes—and I have left some of my papers in the other suit; but I was reading a news item of a debate in the House of Commons, the Imperial House of Commons, in which a Labour member had said that he had been through the Canadian West after a harvest and had seen them in the harvest fields by the tens of thousands, going into the cities because they had nowhere else to go. Did you read that?

Q. No, I did not see it.—A. It was there, to be read. If he had known what he was talking about (evidently he did not)—you see the ills you have in the House of Commons here are reflected in the other House—he would know that they were going into the cities, not because they had not any place else to go, but because they had been brought from East Canada and West Canada, and had to take their journey home to where they came from. I do not know the exact numbers, but I have been to Winnipeg on several occasions and I know it is arranged with the members of the Saskatchewan Government and with the railways to obtain 30,000, 40,000 or 50,000 men to be brought to the central prairies every year to take care of the harvest and threshing, and when harvest and threshing are over they go back to where they came from.

Q. Is there not a large proportion of those men for whom there is no employment available at all?—A. I cannot say about that, but we do require, and nobody knows it better than you, in the harvest time a very large number of casual help, and they are brought out at a very cheap rate by the transportation companies, and they earn exceedingly good wages. I am not complaining, my sympathies are with the wage earner; I suppose that comes from being a wage earner myself, but they earn from \$6 to \$8 a day, the average for the harvest being \$5, and when they are threshing they earn \$6 or \$7 a day. They earn excellent money.

[Hon. George Langley.]

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. Regarding seasonal unemployment among farm workers in Canada; do you think it is greater among the farm workers than among other occupations? I have in mind the harvest labour which lasts about five or six weeks, but for those who are employed six or eight months, is there a greater amount of unemployment among them than among men engaged in railway building or highway building, and some lines of factory work too?—A. No. There is this in favour of the farm worker compared with the bricklayer and the carpenter engaged in building operations. They have to live generally in a town, and they have to provide themselves and their families with food, house accommodation, and so on. The man on the farm does not have anything of that kind; he is fed and fed well, at least that is generally the case; he is fed well, he is provided with comfortable shelter. The days of the sod shack are passing away, thank God, and to-day the farm worker has very comfortable lodging. Except his overalls and his clothing he does not have to spend any money at all. In general he does not have to go to church, the church comes to him, if anything, and they would just as soon see him in his overalls as in a dress suit. The farm worker is the better off of the two. Is that what you wanted to find out?

Q. These unemployed in the cities do not all come from the farms?—A. No. The farmers are more willing to keep the men on. We do not miss a man's board, on the farm. Nobody knows that better than these two Ministers. See what we put upon our tables; they are loaded sumptuously, I am glad to say—mine is at least. It is practically all grown on the farm, and if a neighbour comes in we should regard ourselves as slighted if he did not take a seat at the table and do his best with what was in front of him.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. You said, Mr. Langley, that there was some good free agricultural land south and west of Swift Current; did not the Provincial Government assist in moving some of those people to other parts of the province?—A. No, it was farther down, I think, where they moved them from. It was not a question of land, it was a case of serious neglect; they allowed the land to be overrun with Russian Thistles.

By an Hon. Member:

Q. Would it be possible to absorb 45,000 or 50,000 harvest help that came to Western Canada, and were willing to stay there during the winter? Could you absorb them, if they wanted to stay there?—A. Our friend is hardly serious in putting that question to me. You say that instead of absorbing all you ordinarily use, you want to absorb 40,000 more. The thing is an impossibility. You have to go into these things by degrees.

Q. I am looking for some information. Supposing we increased our immigrants from Great Britain to the extent of 30,000, 40,000 or 50,000 people every year, naturally most of those people would be sure to go to Western Canada. That is natural; you will admit that?—A. Yes.

Q. Could we absorb them?—A. I think we could, and I will tell you why I think so. We are absorbing that number of non-British right now.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Is it not a fact that you are not increasing your population in the three provinces of the Middle West to any considerable extent?—A. We are discreet people. I do not want to discuss it more closely.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. May I ask you this question. We agree that immigration should be the work of the Federal Government; I do not think there is any doubt about that, particularly as to its cost?—A. Exactly.

Q. If we were to spend the same money in the provincial organizations that you and I agree on, do you not think it would be a great incentive to get the provinces to take over the settlement work of colonization?—A. Of the settlement in the districts?

Q. Yes?—A. I do agree with that entirely.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. May I ask the witness to abandon discretion for a moment and tell us frankly what his solution of the conundrum is?—A. No. Our friend is a little lacking in imagination.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until 4 p.m.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The Committee resumed at 4.00 o'clock.

Miss MARGARET E. MACKIE called.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. You have a statement to make to the Committee, Miss MacKie?—
A. Yes.

Mr. Chairman and hon. members of this Committee: speaking as a citizen of the middle west who has had intimate knowledge of the struggles in earlier years of its development of its farming community, and as one who came in touch with the problem of settling the first relay of our post-war colonists—in 1918-19—I desire to endorse the most illuminating and interesting plea of the witness you have heard this morning—the Hon. Mr. Langley—and to set myself on record as feeling keenly the present unsatisfactory position with regard to our post-war British immigration.

To qualify for putting forward such a plea I have studied the problem for one year on the ships entering Canada and travelled for four years almost continuously throughout the British Isles lecturing on Canada and interviewing British applicants. So the statements made by me in regard to the present situation are not hearsay.

I shall not attempt, in the short time at my disposal, to dwell on other events leading up to this position.

During last winter I prepared a report and a solution, but as this turned into a book before it was completed, I am sure you do not wish to have it read; it is called "The Business Side of Immigration." I believe, however, that if time could be given and questions asked one, I am in a position to throw considerable light upon certain disputed points regarding our new system of medical inspection and the failure of our post-war schemes to date, if called upon to do so. However, this might take more time than can be placed at my disposal, though I am quite prepared to remain over if required.

I gather, from listening to the questions put to the Hon. Mr. Langley this morning, that the consensus of opinion is that something is wrong with our schemes to date and that the time has now arrived for facing facts, if we are to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the immigration problem.

[Miss M. E. MacKie.]

The first fact which, so far as I can gather from questions put to Mr. Langley by members of both sides of public opinion, is that Britain will never be able to supply us with sufficient agriculturalists to maintain a British background.

Now that we are all agreed upon that point, the question is what are we going to do about it in view of our own statement that we must have British immigration? To my mind there would appear to be but one solution. That is, do as our forefathers did, and as we were glad to do in pre-war days, namely, take the raw material.

When engaged in colonization overseas and travelling about the British Isles to require to state frequently that Canada must have experienced workers, especially when I knew from intimate study of conditions in agricultural areas just how badly Britain needed her own farm workers and skilled domestic servants, was difficult.

I also knew that conditions in Canada are so different that it is almost as easy to take the inexperienced farm or household helper and train him or her.

Having decided upon British immigration of the raw type we must let our immigration go further forward—or is it back—and do as was done in previous days, namely, colonize them.

It is a reflection on our British men of the post-war period, who have fought for and saved this country for us, to say they will not pioneer, when we have not put before them any scheme since the war for giving them a chance. We can scarcely call the three thousand family scheme pioneering. The last real colonization effort in pioneering was that of the two thousand Barr colonists, over twenty-five years ago. Looking at this undertaking in the light of present conditions in that part of Canada, and studying the results of the wonderful achievement of men who found themselves going through a struggle, of which we have no more thrilling account in all our Canadian history, if we are going to make pioneers of our British immigrants we must take all who are strong and willing and who have left nothing behind to regret. And we must see to it that they are not asked to undergo hardships, so unnecessary, as these same Barr colonists, who trekked over two hundred miles in the spring slush, some on foot, before reaching their destination. If there is one man in Canada to-day who can give us information on the establishment and growth of this Barr colony, and who should be able to help us in placing some of our other settlers, it is the Hon. George Langley, whom I have had the privilege of following as a witness. If we can once establish a settled post-war policy so far as British immigrants are concerned, we may be sure that other Britishers will follow, and that this policy will take care of itself, for the British satisfied settler is the greatest publicity agent we can have. Now, the question is, how can we do this quickly? We are not going to be thin-skinned about the criticisms of our policy. We realize now that we are grown up and Great Britain has asked us to take our share in helping us to establish some of her people. She is prepared to go half way in settling them. As I said, I have a very broad report suggesting a colonization scheme, but, as there is not time to elaborate on this and I have had to briefly state from knowledge of conditions overseas, I should say that our railway companies and the Hudson Bay Company and any other companies who are in a position to do this work on a business basis should be allowed to co-operate with the Government. By "allowed" I do not mean that they are not being allowed to, but they should be used. They have the machinery overseas and they claim that this machinery is rusting, and the quickest way to do is to bring this machinery into operation and go after the raw material. If we could accept the suggestion of Sir Henry Thornton, to give these companies

a few million dollars yearly, and let them go ahead, with the co-operation of the Dominion Government and the provinces, surely with over five hundred thousand people in the British colonies that we never would have had had it not been for the world war, some colonization scheme of a satisfactory type could be evolved. In order that the railway companies did not put transportation before real colonizing effort, we could insist upon reports of those who leave their colonies for any reason, in order that these families shall not be allowed to drift to urban centres and disrupt our own citizens, who, we believe, are being driven from the country. This would take the form of an Immigration Bureau established in connection with each Department of Agriculture in the various provinces, and doing statistical work. I believe that until we put immigration on a business basis and get statistics in connection with what we have in our country now, through a survey, and prove some of the facts that have been given as hearsay—for instance that our people are being driven to the States because of our immigration policy—and also various other statements such as tying red tape around the people—for instance, I can quite understand the Minister of Immigration not wishing to bring people over here who are mentally defective; but I believe that if we had a survey of the conditions of our post-war British immigrants, we would discover that the number of British mental defectives is really smaller than the number of foreign mental defectives. I do not wish to make any statement against the alien immigrant; like the Hon. Mr. Langley. I believe from close investigation of conditions in Alberta and Saskatchewan that he has been a splendid settler, if we take the material alone into account; but I have been advised by someone who really is an authority, or should be, that there are in the asylum in some part of western Canada, in Alberta, 130 mentally defective children who entered with their parents since the war. Now, how are we going to prove these statements? For a long time we have been making them and we have been passing them on. As the Hon. Mr. Langley said this morning, you cannot keep people from talking foolishly, but you can have statements the same as a balance sheet in business and you can check up your debits and credits and find out if this is true or if our British immigrants of the post-war period have been—I do not want to use the word maligned, it is scarcely the word—let us say misunderstood. In connection with this bureau, which would have statistics of the unsatisfactory settlers, whom we should make an effort to place instead of sending them out of the country, we could federate all of these social agencies. The churches are complaining that they are not being given a chance. It would be foolish to create machinery for all of these agencies, and they could all be federated into one great welfare scheme for taking care of these unemployed. In making this statement, I make it from two years' work in Winnipeg, trying to settle post-war immigrants, and I have some knowledge of the conditions there under which these people were required to try and establish themselves. I believe a colonizing idea would do away with a lot of this drifting of families. It is a difficult matter—as those who understand the Old Country and conditions there realize—for an English person or a Scotch or an Irish person to come out here and settle by himself. There is a community life so intimate there, in the Old Country, that these people are lost unless placed near some of their own people. That was well expressed by a letter in the *Montreal Star* a short time ago, from a Yorkshire woman, who had been here fourteen years, and was disappointed with her husband because she could not talk to him about old times. He did not know the part of the country from which she came. There are dozens of social and patriotic societies who are only too willing to introduce and help newcomers, bringing in British immigrants and placing them in batches. By this means we relieve what is really the greatest obstacle to contentment, namely loneliness. The

woman of the family is really the first one to tire of pioneering. If she comes to Canada with several families from her own community these difficulties will be overcome. It was in some such method that our early settlers were placed. And who will say that such cities and towns as Cobourg or Guelph, and various other cities in Eastern Canada, as well as those in the West, were not created by some such settlement? Also by bringing people from every walk in life and settling them together we find that some make a success of farming and the others gradually sift themselves into their old occupations and take care of the farming requirements, thus making an ideal agricultural community. This is the method that we have adopted with the pioneers up to this time, and we have been short sighted in not going after Britishers and giving them the same opportunities. But to do this we must spend money. If one hundred years ago it took several million pounds sterling to settle fifty thousand loyalists, we cannot expect to colonize to-day on the small sums appropriated for immigration.

It will take a long time to get Canada back in a favourable light in the eyes of the British public, and we must spend considerable sums in the right sort of propaganda. Australia has always stressed her bush life and made the most of appealing to the romantic and adventurous spirit—although her propaganda has usually been quite truthful—and the emigrants who go to her expect to rough it and are prepared to do so. Now I can speak from being a lecturer myself in the British Isles and I make this statement, that our propaganda really induces people to expect white collar jobs and expect, in many cases, the city life. I am not blaming any of the immigration officials for this. It is a condition that arose, I believe, before the war, partly through the necessity of attracting people to Canada; but I have found from talking to hundreds and I might say thousands of British people, that the real pioneer spirit has not died and that if we tell these people what we expect of them they are quite prepared to come out here and undertake the pioneering.

It is not possible for me in so short a time to give reasons why we have not been so successful. While it seems unfair to let it go with that bald statement, I am afraid I have to do so, unless I am queried later. That is the propaganda now being disseminated by Canada. While we can get such excellent British material to work with we should try to determine exactly the position with regard to our post-war foreign immigration through this survey already mentioned. To do this I should suggest after this year's completion of the immigration program in connection with the foreigners, the introduction of a quota system. I believe that until these statements have been all cleared away, we should try in the meantime to bring in British people. The quota system also would do away with the question of Orientals now demanding an entry into our country. It was a close study of conditions arising after the war that caused the United States to shut their doors to Continentals, for it is a well known fact, ascertained by those who have studied the problem that the countries of Europe are not allowing their best people to come forward, and we should if we place thirty doctors in the British Isles to see that we are not getting mental defectives, and that we are getting agriculturalists—we should have a relay of doctors also for the Continent, for we have no way of knowing what is coming to us from there.

I have required to change the remarks that I was going to make to-day, on account of following the Hon. Mr. Langley, who so aptly gave the practical side of the western problems.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Miss MacKie, you suggest the adoption by Canada of the quota system. Do I understand that you want to apply that quota system to all countries of Continental Europe on some scale, or apply the same principle to every country

[Miss M. E. MacKie.]

on the Continent of Europe? Of course we could not apply it to the United States, as they do not apply their's to us?—A. No. I believe we have copied the United States in a great many of our immigration regulations, and I believe we have copied some of the least desirable, and should copy some of those that have been made since the war of a more attractive type. For instance, the quota. And in doing this it would be purely for the Continental people and not the people of Northern Europe nor of the United States.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Can I get some idea of what you call the least desirable of the regulations that we have copied from the United States?—A. I am frank in this: my interest in this work is entirely on behalf of the British people, and I am quite prepared as far as I can to elaborate. I refer to the statement that was made that we have copied from the United States this idea of the doctors. Now the United States has twelve times our population and for that reason perhaps is not as desirous of getting British people.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. You have had considerable experience overseas, Miss MacKie, have you not?—A. Yes.

Q. Especially in the Old Country?—A. Yes.

Q. Was it entirely in the British Isles?—A. Entirely in the British Isles, yes.

Q. What do you think is militating against us at the present time and retarding immigration? That is, what is it in our regulations or our mode of procedure that in your opinion is retarding or having a tendency to retard British immigration to this country?—A. I can only go back to 1920, when I first went overseas, when the requirements were less strict, and before we made an effort through assisted passages and various other schemes to attract a certain type of Britisher. I believe that our schemes have failed to fit the larger percentage of the British people, and as the country is small and any reports that are not satisfactory reach all parts of it almost immediately, these dissatisfied people are partly responsible for the propaganda.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. We had no immigration in 1920, had we?—A. You had no scheme, but you had plenty of immigration. I say that because I was on the ships then.

Q. No, we got very few people in 1920. I cannot give the exact figures, but there were practically none. At that time we were busy rehabilitating the soldiers and were not seeking immigrants at all, and there was no immigration in 1920 and 1921. Of course, when I say none, I mean comparatively speaking?—A. One would not expect very many so short a time after the war; but since then there has been gradually built up—I cannot call it anything else, and in doing so I am not reflecting on the department—

Q. Do not be afraid to do that, Miss MacKie.—A. There has been an over-zeal displayed on the part of the colonizing agents and this over-zeal and the immigration requirements have made it difficult for the British person to comply. It is for this reason that I suggest, for a while at least, the open door, or practically an open door.

Q. You made a statement about the immigration policy on the other side having the effect of making people look for white collar jobs when they got over here, that that had a tendency that way. The whole policy of the department has been for agriculturists. Who is to blame for that policy of the white collar job?—A. I believe our propaganda is to blame. If we are going to have selected immigrants, we must promise them certain things. We have been trying to promise them jobs.

[Miss M. E. MacKie.]

Q. What do you ascribe that to?—A. To the over-zeal of the colonization agents. That is sometimes liable to lead to the promise of a white collar job.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Do you mean government appointed agents, or the activities of agents of the big steamship Companies?—A. All our activities.

Q. Of steamship companies and so on?—A. Yes.

Q. I gather from you that the impression you gathered was that these large steamship companies and so on have been placing too rosy a picture before the intending emigrant, in order to get him across to this country, picturing Canada and the conditions here, and what he would have to do when he got here, in too bright and too favourable colours, and in that way leading him to expect a white collar job when he gets over?—A. I do not know that I would care to go as far as that.

Q. In what particular way have these overzealous agents manifested that zeal? You used the term "over zealous"; in what particular way have these agents been over zealous?—A. We call for a certain type of immigrant; we must have an experienced type. These immigrants are not easy to find and most of them are in really good jobs. To induce these people to leave those jobs, we cannot put up to them an offer to pioneer, and the tendency has been to paint conditions in Canada in somewhat glowing colours.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. In your opinion, do you think that the remuneration given for procuring immigrants, the greater remuneration for immigrants from the European countries than from Britain would be the cause of the low number of British emigrants?—A. I did not quite catch that question.

Q. I believe there is a fee of \$5 for securing immigrants under certain conditions for continentals, and \$2.50 for those from the British Isles. Do you think that has had any effect in discriminating against British immigrants?—A. I can only give my own experiences and they are that if the Britisher were sure of a job out here, or, as he calls it, not being stranded—the one fear is of being stranded—they would not care whether any money was even given to them, and would be quite prepared to come if the fares were lower and the money could be raised by themselves. There is a feeling over there against what they call emigrating, because they have the idea that to emigrate is to come across the rough spots. I do not know whether that is what you mean or not.

Q. You were speaking a moment ago of some of the steamship agents being over zealous. Could any of their zeal be due to the greater fee, or commission for continentals than for British? That is the point. Have you had that brought to your attention, in your experience?—A. Well, having at one time been connected with a transportation company, it would be difficult for me to make any statement.

Q. There is another point that you made some observations upon. Have you had a chance to observe where, say, a young man or two young men, brothers, out of a home in the British Isles, would come over and for a year or two work on a farm here and then bring over the rest of the family to work on a farm; have you known of any instances of that nature which have been successful, and what would your suggestion be in regard to those?—A. I think as pot boilers those are all right. I am not reflecting upon any of the schemes; the 3,000 family scheme and the assisted passage scheme are all right in their way, but they are never going to offset the continental flow that is coming in at present, and we must have an immigration scheme from the British Isles

sufficiently comprehensive to do that. In that case it is impossible to deal with individual queries like the one you mention. These all come in under assisted passage schemes.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. When you talk about the continental flow, the trouble is not so much the continental flow as the decrease in the British flow. In 1913 we got about 140,000; last year we only got 70,000, so that we are getting only half as many as we used to get, and there are more restrictions upon continentals to-day than upon other people, notwithstanding the criticism we get of it; still they come?—A. I should not care to criticize continental immigration, so long as we see an equal number or more of British people coming in. I cannot reflect upon the continental immigration, because I do not know sufficient about it.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Might I ask a question. Does that imply bringing in people from other walks of life than those engaged in agriculture, and bringing them to other occupations than agriculture; would that follow?—A. I believe that they should be recruited in sufficiently large numbers to bring them in small colonies. We have only one or two samples of these post war colonies, and we must not judge of their success too quickly.

Q. You are thinking entirely of locating British people on the land, similar to the way people now coming in are located?—A. Yes. I believe that a great deal of our unsettled colonization to date is caused by bringing these people out individually to jobs, and just here I should like to place myself on record as saying that there is just one thing in connection with the families coming out to the cottages, that is, that if a family comes out to a special farmer and is engaged by him, and a cottage is built for him, if that farmer is not satisfied with the family, or if he is inclined to exploit them in any way, the family has no anchorage and is most likely to drift. That is the reason I suggest the recruiting of these people in batches and putting them on the land.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. How are you going to put them on the land? You know very few go on the land?—A. I think we should use the Chronicles of Canada for our text book.

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. I think we should use the Chronicles of Canada for our text book. I think we should go back and study early colonization. We took the people without money, in those days.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Some of us know all about that. We did not get any of these schemes to help us?—A. The business heads of the government probably could arrange a scheme.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Where are you going to get blocks of land in western Canada to settle these people on?—A. We are assuming that it is possible to do so, because it is possible in the case of foreign people.

Q. But what is your scheme?—A. I should not suggest any scheme that would not make at least a partial preparation for these people, but I understand that foreigners are being placed on the land.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. It is a mistake to call any of these people settlers?—A. I did not get that.

[Miss M. E. MacKie.]

Q. You referred to foreigners being placed upon land. They are placed upon the land simply as labourers; very, very few of them go on the land as settlers. They have not got the money?—A. I think perhaps what the foreigner can do the Britisher can do, if we can only work up a scheme for him. The point is this, that we have a chance that we never had in pre-war days, and it is up to us as Canadians who have offered half the price of settlement of these colonists, to plan a scheme.

Q. Have you any scheme in mind yourself; you spoke of what was done in the early days in Canada? What do you know about settlement schemes in early days? I do not think we would want to go back to the conditions of seventy-five or one hundred years ago, when people got large tracts of land here and then got the people out here to really till the land for them; that was the scheme of settlement seventy-five or one hundred years ago, was it not?—A. There must be business people, even in our transportation companies who can work out a scheme and submit it to the government. When the solution has not arrived up to date, it would not be an easy matter to offer a solution. I believe that the scheme of Brigadier-General McRae, with certain modifications, is following out colonization as it should be done to-day.

Q. Just along that line, did you notice that General McRae assumed that the homestead land that would be improved would be worth about \$20 an acre; have you any idea of the value of this outlying homestead land in western Canada to-day? I mean to say, taking the average homestead and spending about \$1,500 on it, as General McRae suggests, what would then be the saleable value of that land?—A. It is just in that one particular that perhaps the scheme is too big for some of the people who are coming out. That is not really pioneering, and some of the settlers would rather come and undertake even more primitive conditions without requiring to take on such a debt.

Q. Well, if you take land that is outside the zone of settlement to-day, homestead land not taken up, it is worth less than nothing to-day, so that if you spend money on it, it is worth a little less than the money you spend on it; that is the case with the districts I know of. If you are going to settle, you must settle on land close to a railway, that is, land that is available for settlement?—A. Not in small quantities.

Q. There are immense tracts of land within fifteen miles of a railway, some of which has been farmed; millions of acres of land have been farmed and are still for sale, but that land which is not convenient to churches, railways and schools is not worth anything.

Mr. DONNELLY: Land can be sold for \$20 to \$25 an acre, thirty miles from a railroad. I saw some of it sold last fall.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps as Miss MacKie has made her statement, we might allow her to retire, unless you care to ask some more questions. Very well, thank you, Miss MacKie.

Witness retired.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, May 9, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., Mr. J. L. Brown, presiding.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We have this morning, Lieut-Colonel Williams, the Dominion Secretary of the Navy League.

Lieut-Colonel CECIL G. WILLIAMS (Dominion Secretary of the Navy League of Canada), called.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We are accustomed to have the witness make a statement of his views; then the members of the Committee will ask any questions they desire. I understand you have a statement to make.

The WITNESS: May I read my statement, Mr. Chairman?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The WITNESS: May I first preface my remarks by saying, Mr. Chairman, that I arrived here in Canada twenty years ago in the steerage of the steamship "Tunisian". The point I want to try to stress to-day is the human factor in immigration, as we see it. I realize that many responsible gentlemen of this country have appeared before you, and practically nothing new is now likely to be produced, that has not already been said; but representing the Navy League of Canada, I speak rather with a view to emphasize certain points; first, as an immigrant. Secondly, from the knowledge I have gained as pastor of large rural churches in Prince Edward and Victoria Counties, Ontario. Thirdly, from my contact with the immigrant during the past nine years as Manager of the Navy League of Canada. And lastly, with some intimate knowledge of the problems confronting those who desire to leave England, not because they are unemployable but rather unable though willing to find work to do.

May I say from personal experience at the commencement, using not idle words, Canada is a wonderful land, full of limitless opportunities, and ready and willing to repay to the full those willing to work hard for her. I think if you will pardon the personal note, I can speak with the more assurance as I arrived here with no letters of recommendation and with only the real desire to work and support those dependent upon my efforts. Since my arrival all my near relatives have followed me to Canada, trusting in my word, and I have not been—neither have they—out of work one day since I entered Canada. My whole thought is immigration from the British Isles, and as I see it, sir, two classes come to Canada:

First, those who come hoping for material benefit, in the prospect afforded them.

And secondly, those seeking a change, easy-pickings if you like; seeking to evade every responsibility.

I believe we should admit the first and do our very best to bar the second. A country desiring the best class of settlers must advertise its good will to-day, and hold out some helping hand to the industrious poor, many of whom would come if assisted. Families, undoubtedly, are best, making for stability and not

[Lt.-Col. Cecil G. Williams.]

liable to become drifters. They, however, unassisted, cannot come, for they cannot save the fare, many of them, to cross into the next county, let alone sufficient to come to Canada, earning only sufficient for daily needs.

There are two reasons which I believe operate at once in England against emigration to Canada in the minds of desirables. The first is the unemployment insurance. You cannot blame them for that. A man who is seeking a new home will take precautions. And the second is old age pensions. May I suggest that when our forebears came to Canada things were not so brisk in the Old Land. Social conditions were vastly different and so they came seeking a better chance. Their problem was altogether different. My problem twenty years ago was different to the problem confronting the immigrant to-day. We say we desire to uphold British traditions and ideals of civilization. Yes, but have not the United States a great problem on their hands to-day, due, may we say, to unwise selection. Should we not therefore, make every effort to bring here or own kith and kin who at least have not to learn to love the Empire?

May I speak now as an immigrant for the immigrant, coming twenty years ago in the steerage of the "Tunisian," I shall never forget my experience as I stood outside the Windsor Station in Montreal with a few dollars in my pocket. I took the train that night for Trenton, Ontario, and by noon the next day I was hired out at \$15 a month, with the usual conditions; milk, wood, potatoes and a small house. I would like to refer to that house again in a moment. I had no capital. I was engaged as a married man from April to November. I could not save a cent. No employment was offered for winter. I had to pay \$2 rent for the little tenant house that was given me during the summer; and but for chopping wood at 50 cents or 75 cents a day and doing odd chores, myself and family would have starved. No man who works faithfully through a long summer season should be turned adrift in the winter. How can this be prevented? I respectfully submit—and I realize how ignorant I am upon this problem but I am speaking from the angle of the immigrant—by erecting a small tenant house with an acre of land and hiring the men for a year and spreading his wages over the year in twelve monthly payments; giving him the free use of the tenant house during the winter in return for chores. It is when a man is out of work in the winter that the wife urges him too often to make the fatal mistake of going into the city or the nearest town. I say it reverently, Mr. Chairman; I thank God I went on the farm. The farm gave me my opportunity, gave me time to become accustomed to Canada; to become acquainted with Canada. Working on the farm there I was able to obtain my junior matriculation and take my course for the Ministry. I could never have done that in the city. Had I arrived in a city I would have been part of the submerged tenth almost from the hour of my arrival.

The fact that so many hired men are out of work during the winter duly reaches England and deters men, who cannot afford to take too great a chance, from coming. I speak from experience. I am not ashamed of the stock from which I sprang. It is a great opportunity for me to appear before this Committee to-day. I have never appeared before such a Committee in my life, but I am not ashamed of the people I came from. They were all workingmen and women, and time after time when I go back to England I go to see my own people in Bedfordshire, Yorkshire and in London, and I ask them why they do not come to Canada? And they tell me, because of the adverse conditions in Canada, and that Canada does not want the folk from the Old Land. I tried to disabuse their minds of that view. The farm is a fine place for a man to commence work, as I said just now, and therefore I would suggest two things:

1. That the farmer employ his men with a signed agreement for not less than one year, said year to terminate in the spring. I think it is nothing short of a crime to discharge a man in October, with probably \$10 in his pocket, facing a Canadian winter.

2. That as far as possible, the State assist the farmer to provide a tenant house, with enough ground to help that chap to raise sufficient vegetables.

Here I realize that I am upon ground that may be disputed, but still I put it forth. I had the good fortune to work for the best type of farmer; and I have also had the ill fortune to work for another type of farmer, the type that if you fall into his hands, makes it pretty hard going. I believe sir, that we should take a leaf from our experience in Canada during the war. You will remember that at first there was a great rush to enlist and then that fell off; and then the Union Government decided that they would call into conference the churches of the land and the societies; and these men went back and held recruiting meetings in their own charges, interviewed farmers, and you remember the magnificent result before Conscription took place. I believe that those same men and women are willing to work for Canada to-day, as they were years ago, and who could do more service? I was four years on that pastoral charge and I know that in speaking to many a farmer I was able to influence him to take a hired man, preferably a married man. I believe that you could do a great deal there. This suggestion may, in some respects, appear to you to be childish; but after all if a farmer calls for a man you can supply the man; but if the farmer does not call for a man, there is nothing doing. It is better to employ a married man than a single man. Now I say again, many farmers would employ in preference a married man, if you would give him a tenant house. There are many farmers who are perhaps afraid to invest their money in a tenant house. But is not this true, in the province of Ontario, which I know pretty well, that a large percentage of the farmers—with great credit and financial advantage to themselves—could employ a hired man if they would. They will tell you, if you speak to them privately, that the State would gain greatly by the employment, as far as possible, of the married man. I have spoken about forming a conference, and now a word about something else. I suggest that we be not afraid of the coming of those who do not desire nor are fitted for work on the farm. Take for argument's sake the fact that there are hundreds of men in Canada to-day who came here—and I do not know how they came—and they are working here. Why I know that is, because we receive perhaps five or six applications a day from married men who are desirous of being joined by their families; family reunion. But a married man cannot send money home and at the same time save sufficient money to bring his family to Canada. I would respectfully suggest that it would be worth the consideration of the Government, or of this Committee rather, the granting of assistance towards bringing the family to Canada, of the man who is already employed in Canada. I sympathize with the Canadian workman who objects, and here, sir, I have written these words: "You would not ask or expect that a Canadian should be removed from his place in industrial employment to make room for a man from the British Isles", but the fact is that many opportunities for employment come, if you speak to the employer; there are proofs that employment for such men is possible. It would seem reasonable to suppose that a Canadian employer having a vacancy on his staff, would not agree to hold that place open for 1, 2, or 3 months, until a man in the British Isles desiring work could be brought forward to fill that place. But lots of employers of labour—I speak from personal experience—having come from the Old Land themselves, and Canadians also, will give a man an opportunity.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. You are speaking of industry now?—A. Yes, sir. Apparently, the expansion in Canadian industry at present is creating openings faster than they can be taken care of by properly qualified Canadians. Now, that may be

[Lt.-Col. Cecil G. Williams.]

open to great criticism, but is not this true? A man comes to me for employment in Toronto. I turn him over very often, to Mr. Dobbs, or try and find him work. He will not go to the bush. He wants to work in the city.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Is not that true of Canadians?—A. It may be proper to add here, sir, that the question might arise in the minds of the Committee "why does the Navy League of Canada concern itself with this matter at all?" Well, because many men arrive in Canada in November, or late in October, yes, and in December they are bringing them. And I say that is a crime to bring anybody in November and December to Canada.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Who brings them?—A. Well, Mr. Forke, I can only speak from my experience from the men who come to my office. They are brought here—

Q. That is all I want to know. I do not want the Department to be blamed for bringing them?—A. No, no, they are not brought by the Department. But, they are brought here, and they come in October, November and December, and I want to emphasize it again, that it is a crime to bring men here at that time.

By Mr. McPhee:

Q. They are excluded by the Department?—A. I can only speak of what I know, sir. They come to us and we endeavour to find them work. We try to place them. If I had the power, with all due respect, sir, I would prevent anyone from coming here earlier than the end of March, or later than the middle of October.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Do the transportation companies bring them?—A. I do not know, sir. We were in England a few weeks ago. Mr. Chairman, I attribute any success I may have had in Canada to habits of discipline, for twenty years being in the Service, and being told what to do, and not being afraid of obeying that order; feeling no loss of self-respect. And, when we were over in England we discussed this question with Lord Jellicoe, and he referred me to a letter which I wonder if I might read to you, which appeared in the "Times", from Earl Beatty. The point I want to make is this; that I believe that if you could get into touch with the Admiralty or the War Office they would be quite willing to assist you with reference to taking men who are approaching expiration of their service, say in the last twelve months. I am speaking now particularly of long service men. Lord Beatty said, in "The Times" of December 31st, 1927, referring to a statement attributed to the Australian Director of Migration. (Reading):

"We are anxious that our vast empty spaces, which must be occupied should be filled with settlers from Great Britain." This sentiment is most commendable and, coming from such a source, gives reason for great hope. I should be grateful if I might be given the opportunity of expressing the view that no better type could be found as settlers than ex-naval men.

So far as I am aware there exists at present no inducement, and very little opportunity even, for these men and their families to settle in our Dominions. It is unnecessary for me to testify to the sterling qualities of men who have served in His Majesty's Navy, but I have recently received a piece of information which has a very direct bear-

[Lt.-Col. Cecil G. Williams.]

ing upon this. It is to the effect that the physical and mental standard in the schools attended by their children in the three naval ports is a very high one, superior indeed to that of other schools under the local authorities. I have every reason to believe this to be true, and the fact that entry into the Navy is made by selection of only the fittest of large numbers of applicants would lead one to expect this.

Throughout his service career the blue-jacket is kept at a high standard of physical fitness, and his training renders him particularly adaptable, and I believe it to be recognized that in opening up new territories the most successful settlers are those who can turn their hands to anything. My object is in no way to appeal to our fellow-subjects overseas for charity for ex-naval men, but only to voice my belief that they would prove a very fine asset to any Dominion in which they could be given an opportunity of becoming settlers.

The age limit for entry to the Government training camps at Claydon and Brandon has recently been raised to 35 years, and this welcome change will enable men who have completed their 12 years' engagement in the Navy to undergo training at these camps, and it is to be hoped that a great many of them will take advantage of this.

I am fully aware of the tendency which exists in the Dominions for the population to drift into the great cities, but I feel that the type of man about whom I am writing has the qualities of self-reliance and perseverance which would render him less liable than some others to be beaten by the difficulties which confront the settler in undeveloped territories.

There is, of course, much to be done in the way of forming village communities which would offer the ordinary amenities of civilization and social intercourse, but this is a question upon which the Dominion Governments have access to much more knowledge and experience than I have.

The seeds of the Empire were planted by the seafaring population of these islands, and I am convinced that the spirit of pioneering and adventure is by no means extinct. In short, I feel that our ex-naval men, with reasonable inducements and facilities, would prove worthy citizens of any Dominion of the Empire.

Now, we saw Lord Jellicoe about this very matter, and he said they were willing to assist. He is now the head of the Legion, taking the place of the late Earl Haig. By the by, we saw Earl Haig three days before he passed out. But, Earl Jellicoe fully confirmed that viewpoint. He was also good enough to say that he would visit Canada. He has written to me since saying he would be unable to visit Canada as he had been appointed to this new position. However, he did stress this, that here were men physically fit, their character known up to date, passing into the ranks of the unemployed, and that if we were to get busy on this, say twelve months before the man's time expired, he would be willing to grant us every facility possible—I am speaking of Canada, of course—to bring those men to Canada. And, without egotism, Mr. Chairman, for I feel this very profoundly, let me say that I can attribute any measure of success I may have had in Canada to those habits of discipline, being taught to obey without feeling loss of self-respect, and not telling the Canadian farmer how to run his job, but doing what I was told to do. The Canadian farmer knows his job well enough.

I would also close the barriers against the unfit. We do not want the weeds, it is the plants. I often wonder what would have happened to me, sir, at St. John twenty years ago in March had I been rejected, my home sold in England, everything gone. Had I been turned back at that period, I would have gone

[Lt.-Col. Cecil G. Williams.]

back destitute, and hopeless and helpless, and therefore, any medical regulations that will be final on the other side are greatly to be commended, and longed for, so that when the family steps on the ship in Great Britain, or even before that family parts with their home, examine them there, letting the man know whether he can go or whether he cannot; I say that is a wonderful asset. And; so I would close the door.

And I would be very particular too, against receiving cases from Poor Law guardians, and people like that. I am simply talking from experience. These people who are brought here in such a way have lost the power to make good, in many instances. How can they make good here under those circumstances? I would be very careful about cases called, what we might term, suspect cases. And I would not allow any man into Canada, outside of farm help, unless an absolute job awaited him.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Will you repeat that again?—A. I would not allow any man into Canada—I am not speaking now of farm hands, sir, nor domestic servants, nor family reunions—unless a job awaited him, with the approval of the Department.

Q. You mean in industry?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. Does that apply to the British-born too?—A. It applies to all, sir. I would not allow a continental in. I would not allow anybody in, let me put it that way.

Q. There was no job awaiting you when you came, and yet you made good?—A. I will qualify it, if you will, sir, by saying I would not allow any man in unless a job was provided for him, unless he was willing to go on the farm. I have to sit on those Social Service bodies in Toronto, and I see the records there, and looking into the history of those men, why, many of them never had a chance before they left England, and the Navy League will never be a party to any policy, nor will we undertake to bring any man to Canada unless we are absolutely assured of a job for him, and we will notify the Department, we will send particulars to the Department.

Here is a suggestion before I sit down, sir, that I would commend to you. It has been well said and it is true, that the poor will help the poor. They will share with them their last loaf, and so you find out here families who have established themselves willing to put up fifty per cent of the fare of their friends who want to come to Canada, always granting that conditions are properly met, and they will provide them with a home until they are settled in Canada. But, I want to emphasize once more, sir, that I think it is a bad state of affairs to bring any one to Canada, for industrial purposes, unless there is work for them to do. But I would help the farmer in every way possible.

I do not think I have anything more to say, sir. I desire to thank you for this opportunity of appearing before the Committee. I realize my limitations, gentlemen.

MR. JACOBS: So far we have not seen any.

WITNESS: Well, I do know that my tongue is cleaving to the roof of my mouth.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions you would like to ask Mr. Williams?

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. I would like Mr. Chairman, to ask a question of the witness. He mentioned about the discipline in the Navy being a very valuable asset. Those were not his exact words, I am merely putting it in my own way. But, he

[Lt.-Col. Cecil G. Williams.]

said it was a very valuable asset to any one coming to Canada who had been in the Navy?—A. Yes.

Q. I would ask if you would consider that discipline in the Navy as a handicap to the man, from the point of destroying, to some degree, his initiative, because here in Canada any one coming from the Old Land has to develop that initiative to a very considerable extent, and I would ask, if, in your opinion, that discipline in the Navy would not have a tendency to destroy that initiative?—A. I would refer you to Earl Beatty's letter as to that. Those men are selected for the Navy, and their children are very good. I would add this one word, that I came from the Navy, sir. I served in South Africa, and in other places. We were landed there, the Naval Brigade, with practically nothing but a spade, and told to get to it, dig. He is a handyman in the best sense of the word. I would not allow that man, as Lord Jellicoe put it, to go into the ranks of the unemployed. His character is up to date, and his physical fitness, and so on and so on.

By Mr. Anderson:

Q. You made the statement that it was felt that Canada did not want English born. What is your reason for making that statement?—A. I will answer that in this way. You know if anyone comes out who is unfit, and who cannot make good, he will write home. Perhaps he belongs to a small community. He will not tell the truth. He does not say, "I do not believe that any man need be out of work in Canada if he will turn his hand to the first job," but he writes back and says "It is a hell of a place". That is what he tells them.

Q. You also made the statement about the industrious poor in England. In Canada, of course, an industrious man can get along. Is it impossible for an industrious man in England, saving his money, to save enough to come to Canada on his own account?—A. The rate of wages he receives in England with the enhanced prices since the war—and I have looked into this very closely because I wanted to help, never dreaming of appearing here—would lead me to say, No sir, he cannot save money to come.

Q. Do you think that that man could make good in Canada if brought out here?—A. I think so.

Q. Have you any suggestions to make as regards the measure of assistance and how it might be given?—A. I believe the British government could help a good deal. I realize the magnitude of the task, and the financial end of it, but I believe the British government would probably be very glad to assist and perhaps give the man something to have in his pocket when he arrives.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. Are you on a farm now?—A. No, I am manager of the Navy League of Canada.

Q. You deserted the farm?—A. I deserted it for higher service. I say that in the kindest way. Gentlemen, do not forget the naval men, and I do not believe there is any need for a man to be out of work in Canada one day, if he will take the job that is offered to him.

Witness retired.

GEORGE H. CORBETT called.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Corbett is the executive secretary of the Society for the Protection of Women and Children of Montreal; I understand he has a statement to give the Committee.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, like the preceding witness this is my first experience before a committee of this kind. Had I had previous

[Mr. George H. Corbett.]

experience, in all probability I would have framed my evidence in a more acceptable and intelligent fashion.

I am appearing on behalf of three social agencies, the Society for the Protection of Women and Children of Montreal, Family Welfare Association of Montreal, and the Canadian Prisoners' Welfare Association of Montreal. These are all agencies affiliated with the Montreal Council of Social Agencies. I refer to your attention:

Section 80 of the Dominion Immigration Act and Regulations reads:

All expenses incurred in administering this Act and carrying out the provisions thereof, and of affording help and advice to immigrants, and aiding, visiting, and *relieving destitute immigrants*, procuring medical assistance and otherwise attending to the objects of immigration shall be paid out of any moneys granted by Parliament for any such purpose, and under such Orders in Council, if any, as are made for the distribution and application of such monies.

The experience of our Association is that notwithstanding the above Section, the Dominion Immigration Officers in Montreal claim that they have no funds, neither are they empowered to relieve destitute immigrants, the burden of which is laid upon this and other private relief-giving societies, and that in view of the fact that our society is the only one receiving a grant from the city of Montreal that when deportation proceedings are found to be necessary that such cases are referred to our Association for financial assistance so that proof may be produced that the family have "become a public charge."

It is the belief of our Association that sufficient moneys should be allocated by Parliament to enable Section 80 of the Immigration Act to be placed into successful operation, and that the Department of Immigration should by law be responsible for advising, aiding, visiting and relieving destitute immigrants, and failing this that the obligation of caring for immigrants should, by law, devolve upon the agency bringing the family to the country. We believe, however, that in view of the large number of such agencies, that the Immigration Department should be made responsible for seeing that the necessary aid and care is secured from the agencies mentioned. In the event of an immigrant not entering Canada under the care of any specific private organization, the Department of Immigration should undertake responsibility for the case, as outlined in section 80. We have actually had cases referred for our care by the local Officer of Immigration, with a request that deportation papers should be made out. We believe that in the event of the local officer being satisfied that an immigrant is undesirable, that they should take steps to bring the case before a Court of Enquiry.

It has been the experience of our Association that there is apparently unnecessary delay in the deportation of undesirable immigrants, and we have been informed that this delay is due to the pressure of work on an inadequate staff at the headquarters in Ottawa. We have found, however, that there has been delay in apprehending an immigrant when the deportation papers have been received by the local officers, and it is our belief that if the cost of relieving destitute immigrants were placed upon the Department, deportation proceedings would be considerably expedited.

Clause 80, referred to above, also lays the responsibility of procuring medical assistance for immigrants upon the Department, and we have contended that following, as it does, the words relating to relieving destitution, that the Department should be responsible for the cost of such medical assistance.

Owing to lack of Convalescent Home facilities, we have had patients referred to us for care in their own homes, which has necessitated the provision of nursing care, the payment of which has been refused by the local Department on the grounds that they have no authority to do so.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. How long would you have the Department responsible?—A. Five years.

Q. Until they are naturalized?—A. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact in the city of Montreal the municipal authorities refuse hospitalization until these people have been in Canada five years. The hospitals do respond in cases of extreme emergency, but in cases where only preventive medical treatment is required, private philanthropy has to look after them.

Q. You are not suggesting that the department should be responsible for the health of an immigrant for five years after his arrival?—A. I do not know how we will meet that emergency.

Q. I asked that question because I want to get it clear in the minds of the Committee that the immigration authorities do protect the immigrants until they are landed and placed.—A. They are not citizens for five years. I cannot speak generally; I am speaking only of Montreal.

Q. I have no objection to your statement but I want you to make it clear to the Committee that you refer to a five year period.—A. That is the limit placed by the municipal authorities; that is the field in which I am working; that is the limit we are up against. I have no particular suggestion to make in the matter, but that is one of the matters which should be considered in connection with this affair.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. Do you say the hospital authorities refuse to receive an immigrant?—A. Without guarantee of payment, except in great emergency. That is a municipal rule.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. They do receive them for outdoor treatment?—A. Yes, under the Social Service Department of the various hospitals.

Q. Take the Royal Victoria and the General Hospital—with which I am better acquainted—they receive immigrants for outdoor treatment during the first five years, but not as indoor patients?—A. No, excepting in cases of great emergency.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. If a patient should become worse the hospital will take him in?—A. Only in emergency cases. We have had cases where they refused to accept them; they did not consider the emergency was great enough.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I would like to say that in the city of Winnipeg the hospital doors stand wide open for every case necessary for hospital treatment.

The WITNESS: I can only speak generally.

Mr. JACOBS: I have seen scores and scores of cases treated in the hospitals on Montreal in the public wards. If they do not treat immigrants in the public wards they might as well close them down.

Mr. CAHAN: I know immigrants who have come in for my own domestic service and have been taken ill, and whenever they were sent to hospital, I, as their employer, had to pay the hospital charges.

The WITNESS: Yes, and had you refused to underwrite that responsibility, in all probability this party needing medical attention would have had to remain for many weeks before she could have secured the necessary care. I know that is true although it sounds extreme.

Mr. JACOBS: It sounds unchristianlike.

[Mr. George H. Corbett.]

Mr. CAHAN: I think, from my experience, the witness is giving a fair statement.

The WITNESS: I have some specific cases here, although not on that subject.

Our Case No. 4058 is an example of what we believe to be unnecessarily protracted delay on the part of the immigration authorities to act.

Estelle Sarah Reynolds née MacMillan, born Scotland, November 8, 1890.

Alec Reynolds, born April 17, 1913, Glasgow.

Mollie Reynolds, born February 15, 1917, Glasgow.

Our Case Reference No. 4058.

Department of Immigration—reference No. Ottawa 177977.

Department of Immigration—reference No. Montreal 37222.

Mrs. Reynolds, who it is alleged had been deserted by her husband, an ex-soldier, came to Canada in the early part of 1925, seeking to establish herself independently and to make provision for her two children who had been left in destitute and necessitous circumstances, as a result of the desertion of the husband and father as before mentioned. Mrs. Reynolds engaged as a domestic servant, and latterly did day work. She succeeded so well, that she was able to make a home here and provide for the transportation of her two minor children above named.

The children joined her in February, 1927.

During the typhoid epidemic, however, Mrs. Reynolds sickened and died, her death taking place in St. Paul's Hospital on April 16, 1927.

The two children were thus left destitute and were referred to our attention in the early part of May, 1927.

The point is that they were returned to us for the purpose of deporting them as public charges, and they were not deported for 79 days afterwards.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. But she had been working and earning money in Montreal?—A. Yes. She just had enough to bring her family here, two children, but after the children were left without their mother, or without any breadwinner, they were in a charitable institution for 79 days, and we believe that was too long.

On May 13th we placed the case in the hands of the local Dominion Immigration Authorities, making our depositions on the forms provided and also furnishing a declaration from the relatives in Scotland, that should the children be returned, they would be received and domiciled.

In the meantime, we had, with the assistance of the Montreal Children's Bureau and their moneys, privately provided (these children are Roman Catholics) made such provision for the children as was required.

The children were not deported until July 30th, 1927, a delay of 79 days."

The next case is that of Rudolph DeLinde.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. Give us the number of that case?—A. The Ottawa reference number is 216,485, and the Montreal reference number is 32,708. This is another case in which expensive delay occurred:

Rudolph DeLinde, Gerda Victorina Blud, Swedish, married October 12th, 1912, Antwerp.

[Mr. George H. Corbett.]

Nina DeLinde, 1916, born, Denmark; Lillegut DeLinde, 1923, born, Denmark; Alan DeLinde, 1925, born, Montreal Maternity Hospital.

"DeLinde arrived in Halifax, N.S., in May, 1924, and Mrs. DeLinde followed him, with the children in August, 1924.

Case was reported to us by the Dominion Immigration authorities themselves (local office) on July 14th, 1925, when we were advised that at the Olympic Hotel, Windsor street, a baby boy, that is Lillegut, had been left alone, his mother having been taken to the Montreal Maternity Hospital about 11 o'clock on Sunday night preceding, and there being nobody to take care of the child, our services were required. Lillegut was referred by us to the Montreal Children's Bureau and Mrs. Davidson, the then Executive Secretary of that Institution, placed the child in her Receiving Home.

The case was complicated in the first stages by the absolute inability of Mrs. DeLinde to speak in any other language but Swedish, and on July 16th, we endeavoured to interest the Swedish Consul, but were informed by that individual, that there was nothing that the Consul could do, or as he put it, "he did not care to mix up in it". I am advised that the Swedish Consul also stated at that time, that the welfare associations should take care of such people, as if Canadians were so stranded in Sweden, they would be taken care of by welfare bodies there. The Swedish Consul also refused to supply an interpreter, but one of the stenographers, in his office, kindly consented to act unofficially, and it was through this stenographer that we learned that Mrs. DeLinde arrived with Lillegut in St. Johns, Newfoundland, to join her husband, and with him she proceeded to Halifax, after some few months' residence in the Newfoundland town, and that she had been subsequently deserted by her husband, who took with him the elder of the two children then living, going to some unstated destination in the United States. We prosecuted inquiries for this man through the United States Immigration authorities but failed to locate him.

In the meantime, Mrs. DeLinde had given birth to the third child and was a public charge, and on August 20th, 1925, after further consulting with the Dominion Immigration local office, we made the usual application for the return of Mrs. DeLinde and her dependent children to either Sweden or Denmark, according to the visa findings. Perhaps that is not the correct term.

Pending action on the part of the Immigration authorities, Mrs. DeLinde was placed in the Sheltering Home. On September 15th, 1925, a Board of Enquiry was held and Mrs. DeLinde and her dependents were found to be deportable, but she was, however, allowed to sign an appeal to be permitted to stay in Canada, and the local Immigration Office advanced the suggestion that they might be able to get her a position with her baby, should her appeal be decided in her favour.

Shortly after this, we located DeLinde in New York City, but before action could be taken he had again moved on.

In January, 1926, we addressed the Minister of Immigration in this matter and received a reply from the Division Commissioner, Reference No. 216485, advising that the Dominion Immigration Agent, Montreal, was being instructed to take Mrs. DeLinde before the Swedish Consul again in an endeavour to procure for her a Swedish passport, so that she might be returned to Sweden. Nothing happened, however, and Mrs. DeLinde was still on our hands, and during the first week in February, 1926, Mrs. DeLinde and her two children were taken off our hands by a private individual.

[Mr. George H. Corbett.]

The point raised here is, that Mrs. DeLinde and her two children were found to be in destitute and necessitous circumstances by the local Dominion Immigration Office at the beginning of July, 1925, but they remained charges on us, or other agencies, as well as receiving benefit under the Q.P.C. for a period of almost eight months.

The next is, Ottawa reference number 2000088, Montreal reference number 31347, our case number 1954:

Re Hoare alias Moore

John Hoare alias Moore

Alice Dobby, alleged to have married above named in a Registry Office, Fullum, London, April 3rd, 1919—not verified.

Children:—

George Candie, born 1912—inmate Shawbridge Boys Farm.

Alec Candie, born 1917—inmate Shawbridge Boys Farm.

NOTE:—Both above illegitimate children of Hoare to a Mrs. Condie.

Alice, born 1915 in England—love child.

Jack, born 1919, in England.

Rose, born 1921 in St. Johns, P.Q.

Doris, born 1922 in Cowansville, P.Q. Baptized Moore.

Baby, born Sept. 26, 1924, Montreal Maternity Hospital.

NOTE:—The five last mentioned are at present charges on the roll of the Montreal Children's Bureau and the Q.P.C.A. and have been since August 21st, 1924.

Hoare was in Canada prior to the War and enlisted in the Canadian Veterinary Corps at Montreal, at the end of 1914. One child, it is alleged, was born to his intimacy with a Mrs. Candie before he went overseas. The second child, Alec, also born to him by Mrs. Candie, was the result of intimacy that took place during the War, when he was invalidated home after having been struck off the strength at Shorncliffe, due to being medically unfit. He returned to Canada and after a short period here, went back to England and enlisted in the Imperial Forces. It was while he was serving in the C.E.F. that he became acquainted on the other side with the woman whom we know as Mrs. Hoare, and doubtless the child Alice is the result of intimacy which took place before his marriage to our Mrs. Hoare, which was shown (but not verified) as having taken place on April 3rd, 1919, in London.

In any case, Hoare and his consort were "repatriated" to Canada in the month of May, 1920, via ss. *Royal George*. Within twelve months after their arrival, they were applicants for charity, being known to the Montreal Children's Bureau in April, 1921. They received help also from the Family Welfare Association in the month of June, 1924, and also around the same period from Christ Church Cathedral Social Service Organization. During the period between 1921 and July, 1924, this couple, with their children, were living in St. Johns, Cowansville and other country places and were known as beggars. However, on August 1st, 1924, Hoare and his wife rented a room at 283 Ontario St. West, Montreal, placed their four children therein, Alec, Jack, Rose and Doris, and abandoned them. The matter was referred to us in due course and the children were received on August 4th, 1924, at the Receiving Home. We have never been able to trace Moore from that day to this.

On September 15th, 1924, Mrs. Hoare returned to Montreal alone, and in a pregnant condition. She applied for and was given shelter at our Sheltering Home on this date, but registered under the name of

[Mr. George H. Corbett.]

"Moore". It was there that we found her quite by accident. She was then in a pregnant condition. The fifth child was born, "Baby", on October 18th, 1924, at the Montreal Maternity Hospital. For several months we bent every effort, as our record will prove, to bring the absent Hoare to book, but failing in this, we laid the whole case before the local immigration office on March 30th, 1925, under the five-year period.

The local Immigration Office replied to our letter of March 30th on June 10th following, and we were then advised that the case had been carefully considered by a Board of Enquiry, but that the Department had no jurisdiction to deport families of Canadian soldiers (Hoare was latterly an Imperial).

On June 12th, 1926, we received a letter from Ottawa, in which enquiry was promised. We replied to Ottawa, giving a full record of this case, and a further reply from Ottawa was received on June 18th, 1926, acknowledging our communication, and also advising us that according to evidence submitted Hoare and his wife and the first two children to his marriage with her, were not returned to Canada for demobilization and hence did not obtain the status of a Canadian soldier's family, thus preventing them from becoming subject to deportation from Canada.

We received another letter from Ottawa, on July 9th, 1926, in which we were advised that enquiries were being instituted by the Department of Immigration in the British Isles with a view to ascertaining whether there were any relatives there who were in a position and willing to receive and provide for Mrs. Hoare and her five children, and that if it was found that arrangements for their care could be made an effort would be made to have Mrs. Hoare and her five children returned to England.

Just about this time, the question of Mrs. Hoare's mental status was raised, and she was examined by Doctors Mitchell and Silverman of the Mental Hygiene Committee, and their original findings forwarded to Ottawa on July 3rd, 1926. The findings of both Dr. Mitchell and Dr. Silverman showed that she was definitely a feeble-minded individual and doubtless would remain a public charge and recommending deportation.

Further correspondence was had with Ottawa in this matter, and the final letter which we received from the Immigration Department was dated November 11th, 1926, in which we were advised that investigation in the British Isles indicated that Mrs. Hoare's relatives were evidently not in a position to receive her and the children, although they might be able to receive Mrs. Hoare. This letter also states, that "the evidence submitted, appears to indicate, that Mrs. Hoare, or Moore, on arrival in Canada, belong to the classes prohibited from entry to this country, and if it is decided to deport Mrs. Hoare and family, you will be advised in this regard."

It might be here noted, that in a letter which we received from the Department on the 15th July, 1926, the Commissioner stated that "it will be recognized that if certificate can be furnished, showing Mrs. Hoare to belong to any of the classes above mentioned (that is subsections A and K of section 3 of the Immigration Act) and to have undoubtedly belonged to such classes at the time of entry to Canada in May, 1920, there would probably be little difficulty in the matter of proceeding with deportation."

Mrs. Hoare is still with us, several attempts to institutionalize her having produced most unsatisfactory results. Her five children are still as before stated, with the Montreal Children's Bureau, where they have been since the 4th August, 1924. Mrs. Hoare visits her children occa-

[Mr. George H. Corbett.]

sionally, and in company with a man whom she has described as her "cousin".

Several other cases to the same effect could be outlined, notably the Charlton case, our record 3107, and the Murdock case, our record 2278, but the cases I have cited herein are sufficient, I believe, to indicate that some improvement could be made.

Immigrants and Delinquency: The Secretary of the Canadian Prisoners' Welfare Association (John Kidman) reports that frequently he has young men discharged from jail applying for help who are comparatively new arrivals in Canada.

Most of these cases are not for crime, but for vagrancy arising out of unemployment in the winter. From our observation it is evident that these young men come to Canada in the summer season when work is plentiful, but as soon as the winter comes, they are the first to be out of work as being less experienced.

The vagrancy laws in Canada, especially in Montreal, appear to be more severe than in the British Isles, and the Englishman, Scotchman or Irishman is surprised to be arrested on the streets of Montreal at 7 or 10 o'clock at night merely because he looks down at heel.

When these men are arrested, so far as Montreal is concerned, they do not understand the court procedure at all, as much of the talk over their heads is in French, and they are switched into jail for a fortnight or thirty days.

Quite a few of the young men who come out as workers on the land go on to farms in the summer on arrival, but get paid off and instinctively make for the nearest city. The Prisoners' Welfare had three such young fellows in, Scotch, recently, all of whom had been sent to jail for vagrancy.

Recommendations

- (1) That young men and youths coming to Canada should be given some general lectures on board ship as to the practical difficulties that may occur in regard to the dislocation of trade in relation to seasons so that they may be prepared for this.
- (2) That every immigrant should be given a card with the name and address of a clergyman, a welfare worker, or of the local representative of the Dominion Immigration Department, so that if he gets into any trouble whatever, unemployment, or with the police, within one year of arrival, advice and help would be obtainable.
- (3) That the Dominion Immigration Department should issue a request to lower court judges and magistrates to hold all cases over for investigation, either by the department, or the Salvation Army or some other welfare agency, where it appears that the accused is a recent arrival in this country.

I wish to make myself understood, Mr. Chairman. I am not criticizing, I am merely relating my experience in dealing with these people who fall between a number of stools after they arrive in Canada.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. You deal with thousands of cases?—A. Yes.

Q. And you could instance many more than these, I suppose?—A. I could instance many more, but it is useless to give more cases that are similar in principle.

[Mr. George H. Corbett.]

Q. But you are aware that when we are bringing 2,000 or 3,000 people a week there will be cases like these occasionally?—A. What would you do with the two Reynolds children?

/Q. I do not remember those?—A. They were found on the streets of Montreal, without any parents or guardians. The city of Montreal public welfare authorities refused to institutionalize these children. It comes to a question of providing private funds.

Q. Did you endeavour to have them taken up and cared for by the Scottish Benevolent Society?—A. No. We went through all our own benevolent societies, to send them back. We tapped every source we knew of.

Q. The British Immigration Society of Montreal?—A. Yes. They refused to deal with their own kith and kin. The Irish Protestant Benevolent Society recommend their own compatriots for deportation. We have no means of looking after them.

Mr. JACOBS: They do not do that, in the Jewish societies.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. On the average, how many cases come before the three societies which you direct?—A. The three societies annually?

Q. Yes.—A. About 2,200. They are not persons, but units. Family units or single individuals, as the case may be.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Have you any further suggestions to make to the Committee?—A. No, they are all contained in my memorandum. There are a number of recommendations there which I have not read.

By Mr. Heaps:

Q. How many persons were arrested for vagrancy, in Montreal, last year, who were out of work?—A. Could that question be repeated, please?

Q. How many persons were arrested because they happened to be out of work, and were taken to jail?—A. I don't know. Of those who were recent arrivals, twenty-three. I may say that in the records of our Social Agencies we find that the new arrivals constitute considerably the least part of our troubles. But they constitute the more troublesome part of our troubles, because we cannot draw on public funds for augmenting the relief we give. For instance, if we have to put a destituted child into an institution it costs us from \$15 to \$24 a month to maintain that child according to proper standards. The public grants only \$7.20 and we have to apply to private philanthropy for the difference between \$7.20 and \$15, or \$24 as the case may be, according to the child's requirements; and we have a very wide field to spread it over.

Mr. CAHAN: In my own constituency I have cases come to me simply because I represent the constituency, and in some years it costs more than my entire indemnity to defray the expenses of people who are down and out; people who have been sent to jail and are coming out of jail and do not know where to go and I can say this that I have about 3,500 Jews in my constituency.

Mr. JACOBS: I think some of them apply to me.

Mr. CAHAN: It appeals to a man's emotions and it is impossible to resist the appeal. I do not know what their association with the Immigration Department is, but I certainly can commend the work of these societies.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. In cases of destitution somewhat similar to those you have related that occur in families that have been ten years in Montreal, will the city provide for

[Mr. George H. Corbett.]

them?—A. Absolutely. It is no trouble then. We institutionalize them as quick as wink.

Q. And is it that you feel that in the case of recent arrivals in Canada the Immigration authorities, that is finally the Dominion Government, should make a similar provision for those to that which the city makes to its own people?—A. Well, that perhaps is the nucleus of my thought. As I said before, I am absolutely unqualified to make any sensible recommendation to a committee of this kind. I am merely giving you my experience. Here we are faced with a heavy population which the previous witness has described as the submerged tenth, but it might possibly be a quarter, trying to make bricks without straw. We turn to the Immigration Department for advice and assistance and dispatch in the matters which we, perhaps inadvisedly think should rest under their supervision, until at least they have qualified as Canadian citizens.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. Having regard to the number of cases, Mr. Corbett, that come before you, would you say that these particular immigration cases are infinitesimal numerically?—A. Yes Mr. Jacobs. In my last three annual reports I pointed out that less than six per cent of the total burden of work that rests on our agencies come from arrivals who have been here under six months; about sixteen per cent from those who have been here under five years. But this is what we are faced with, the difficulty of obtaining relief from city funds or provincial funds in the face of an arbitrary ruling that they absolutely disregard the requirements of those who have been here less than five years, or less than six months in the case of residents who have moved from one province to another, and which does not come into the scope of this inquiry. I am not criticizing. I know perfectly well that this Committee has a huge task before it. I am merely pointing out a few instances where perhaps a little consultation and counsel might point the way to a better understanding. I have pointed out that there are instances which are quite numerous where men certainly get into trouble because they have absolutely no knowledge of the conditions of Canadian life before they land here.

I have another case, if I may take the time of the Committee, to refer to it, where a man by the name of Charlton came out here from the British Emigration Society, I believe in collaboration with a society in Montreal, the name of which I cannot recall at the moment. He came out as a farmer. In the evidence taken before the local Immigration authorities, his wife swore that he could not milk a cow, he had never hoed a potato in his life, and that the only thing that he had ever done on the farm was to drive a team of horses. Within a month of their arrival we found that the oldest child had a congenitally weak heart. When I say that I am giving medical evidence it is true, but that was told to me by the General Hospital authorities. The second oldest child had to be hospitalized. The woman had a running ulcer on her leg, which the doctors said was incurable, and she had a severe case of varicose veins on both legs. Now those people landed in Montreal after failing to adjust themselves on a farm in Ontario, and they became a public charge within thirty-six hours of their arrival, and we have still got them. They are still public charges.

Q. That was due to bad medical examination, was it not?—A. To bad selection. That man was no more a farmer than I am.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. When did they arrive?—A. In the early part of 1920. They were sent out by the Poplar Poor Law Guardians who paid £90 to the British Dominion Emigration Society to send them out here, and they have been a drain on our funds.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. Are they still a charge on your society?—A. Absolutely, sir. The Poplar Poor Law Guardians paid £90 to the British Dominion Emigration Society to bring them here, and that is all they did. They are still here. The local Immigration Department practically decided to deport these people. I think it was an act of kindness to send these people back to where they would have the advantage of legislation in the way of sick benefits, unemployment insurance and old age pensions. They will never be suitable for this country. It is better to send them back than to have them starving here and taking bags of coal from philanthropic institutions. I had the case right to the point where the local Department decided to send them back, but because some sentimental social worker said it is too bad to send these people back, and we should keep them here—they are still here.

Q. Will you state the name of this family?—A. I have given the name. It is Charlton.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That is all thank you, sir. Colonel Tudge of the Salvation Army is here.

Witness retired.

Colonel THOMAS R. TUDGE called.

WITNESS (Reading):

"I am here to-day at the invitation of this Committee, I understand, to make a statement in regard to the work of the Salvation Army Migration and Settlement Department, especially relating to that of Canadian Settlement. At the outset I would remind the Committee that the work of immigration is not our primary business but is a side line of social service imposed upon us by reason of our unique international organization. We are established in the majority of the older countries across the sea as well as in all the dominions and colonies of the Empire; by virtue, therefore, of our position we are thus enabled to do something to bring the seeds of those lands together.

In Great Britain and Ireland we have a permanent staff of experienced officers and workers exclusively set aside for the recruiting and advising of desirable migrants, most of whom have first hand knowledge of Canadian conditions, while in Canada we have a permanent immigration staff whose entire work is to seek out positions for and arrange the settlement and aftercare of the new arrivals. In addition to these permanent departmental officers we have 5,772 Salvation Army Officers throughout Great Britain and Ireland and over 1,615 officers in Canada who can be and are enlisted at any time required to help in this work.

The Salvation Army Migration and Settlement Department came into being in 1903 as the result of many calls for help and assistance received in Great Britain from people who desired to migrate.

The founder, General William Booth, when laying the foundations upon which the Department was to be built up emphasized four factors, that its work must be:—

- (1) Helpful to the individual.
- (2) Acceptable to the Old Land.
- (3) Advantageous to the New Country.
- (4) That the absorbing power of the new country, and never the pressure of conditions at home, must always determine the flow of emigration.

[Lt.-Col. Thomas Tudge.]

During the past 24 years we have settled in Canada over 100,000 people, with less than one per cent failures. From 1922 to March 31, 1927, the total number introduced is 24,456 made up as follows:—

Single women	8,819
Boys for farm work (5 years only)	2,050
Single men	4,205
Orphan children	911
Families, including parents	1,925
and children	1,875
Families: Wives joining—	
husbands	1,411
children	1,705
Widows	822
Children accompanying widows	703
	24,456

During the same period the Army has assisted financially as follows:—

Amounted granted (Given) to migrants by army . .	£32,772
Amount loaned, to be repaid	60,522
	£93,294

The Army is not working for private profit. All commissions earned in carrying on the work are devoted entirely and exclusively to the migration and settlement work itself and do not in any way go into the Salvation Army's other funds. On the contrary, grants towards this work have to be obtained from these other funds.

In Canada the accounts are audited by Messrs. Edwards Morgan and Company, and in England by Messrs. Knox, Cropper and Company, and balance sheets published annually. Particulars on expenditure and after-care are submitted yearly to the Overseas Settlement Department of the British Government who are pleased to approve of the work and contribute toward the expenditure incurred.

In pre-war days the Army chartered special ships to bring out migrants whom they had recruited, and we were also the pioneers of "personally conducted" parties, in this way giving the migrant the best security in making the great adventure. As far back as 1903 we trained men on our farm in England for agricultural work in the Dominion.

It might be well for me to say emphatically here that the people coming to Canada under our auspices, except a very small minority, are not Salvationists. The following analysis of 8,000 sailed cases will serve to show that the organization carries on its work quite irrespective of creed.

- 40 per cent belonged to the Church of England
- 20 per cent belonged to the Presbyterian Church
- 16 per cent belonged to the Wesleyan Congregational and Baptist Churches
- 15 per cent belonged to the Salvation Army
- 5 per cent belonged to the Quakers, Plymouth Brethren, etc.
- 4 per cent belonged to the Roman Catholic Church.

"In these twenty-five years the Army has opened up a system of Reception Lodges from the Atlantic to the Pacific at Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, London, Winnipeg, Vancouver and later, special centres for boys'

work were opened at Moncton, Smith's Falls, Woodstock and Brandon, to deal exclusively with new arrivals.

For this specific purpose a special lodge property was erected in Vancouver in 1907 and the Winnipeg lodge followed in 1908. In all these, accommodation and meals are provided free of cost.

I think we can claim to be the largest, as well as one of the oldest, voluntary societies dealing with emigration and settlement.

A new era was opened with the passing of the Empire Settlement Act 1922 and we readily realized that there would naturally be a change in the procedure in regard to emigration and immigration. The Government of Great Britain were prepared to find money to assist desirable people overseas, and the Army in its endeavour to be of service prepared at once to extend its activities.

In June 1922 a new scheme for the transplantation of boys between the ages of 14 and 18 years, to be placed on farms throughout the Dominion, was submitted by Commissioner Lamb and approved by the then Acting Minister of Immigration. The first party arrived in April, 1923, and since that date 2,050 lads have been settled (not including those who have arrived this year). Unfortunately, last year a sharp controversy arose regarding this work which resulted in us not being able to send as many boys as we might have done owing to certain restrictions imposed upon us. This difficulty, having now been settled, we hope to return as quickly as possible to the normal flow of this class of settler. The boys are first trained and tested on the Army's 2,000 acre farm at Hadleigh, Essex, inspected by the Canadian Government official in regard to physical and moral fitness, and if passed they are provided with a suitable outfit before embarking for Canada with a personally conducted party. On arrival they go to one of our Receiving Homes and are placed with farmers in that vicinity, subsequently receiving suitable aftercare which could not be in any way called spoonfeeding.

To carry on the aftercare work efficiently we opened four new centres exclusively for such boys at Moncton, Smith's Falls, Woodstock and Brandon. Unfortunately, during the year we have been compelled to close two of these Receiving Homes owing to lack of funds, and in the case of Brandon lack of funds and certain restrictions enforced by a new Act.

I am pleased to state in connection with the settlement of boys that we have met with considerable success for, since 1923, out of the 2,050 boys introduced to Canada at the end of 1927, we had only 35 deports, and in connection with the 523 boys introduced during 1926, we are in a position to report that at the first of January, 1928, five had been deported, 18 had returned to the Old Land, and of the remaining 500, 90 per cent were still on farms.

It may be well for me to state here that these boys are not wards of some benevolent society in the Old Land whose primary concern is to find an outlet or career for them, but they are selected from ordinary working class families in the British Isles.

This work has naturally cost the Army a great deal of money and it is only insofar as the required money can be raised that we can continue with such work.

The Army first established the "Reunion of Families," in 1905 and has spent many thousands of dollars in loans and grants, to assist deserving people to migrate and establish homes in the Dominion.

Mr. SPOTTON: This is a voluminous matter, Mr. Chairman, and it will be printed, and I was just thinking that with the disability of the speaker and it

[Lt.-Col. Thomas Tudge.]

being nearly one o'clock, if it meets with the approval of the speaker and the Committee, it would cover the matter if it were taken as read.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think it would be a good thing, as suggested by Mr. Spotton, if this could appear on the record, because then the members of the Committee would have to read it, and the witness could be called so that the members could ask questions. If he is going to read into the record all that he has in his hand, it will take him till six o'clock to-night.

WITNESS: I was not proposing to read it all, sir.

Mr. SPOTTON: If you desire to get that on the record, I think it would facilitate matters if it were taken as read.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The usual custom, of course, is to ask questions of the witness.

Mr. VALLANCE: Of course, it is only a suggestion that this be put in.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The witness does not belong to Ottawa. I think it would be well for him to continue.

WITNESS: Since 1923 the Army has had an agreement with the Overseas Settlement Department of the British Government sharing on a 50-50 basis on the cost of transportation of such families. All families so brought to Canada have been subject to the approval of the Director of Immigration in London. Until the current year, the Department has been satisfied with the Army's guarantee that the Settlement arrangements for the family were adequate. This year, however, new regulations are in force, and before a family can be given a free grant by the Army and/or the British Government, it is necessary for the Department at Ottawa to check up the settlement arrangements and approve or otherwise before a sailing permit can be issued. This matter comes under subsection "h" of section 3 of the Immigration Act.

If a loan is made to the family, which is required to be repaid, it is not necessary to secure the approval of the Department.

The Army Immigration Department has, since the inception in 1903, ever placed the migration of single women, of good physical and moral standing, in the forefront of its program. The Army was one of the first organizations to organize personally conducted parties of young women across the Atlantic and to establish Reception Lodges in this country.

At the present time, the recruiting of the trained domestic from the British Isles is a difficult matter as the opportunities there are quite as good for trained girls as they are in Canada. Nevertheless, there are large numbers of girls who are domesticated, that is, capable of doing plain cooking and general housework, who are willing to enter household service in Canada. Experience teaches us that there are hundreds of homes in Canada who will welcome such a girl and we have experienced no difficulty in placing hundreds during the last few years.

From 1921 to the end of 1927 we brought 5,542 women for domestic service, and of this number the total deported during the same period was 49 (less than one per cent of the whole).

For many years we operated loan funds for various Provincial Governments, and then with the passing of the Empire Settlement Act the Federal Government in conjunction with the British Government made loans to domestic servants (approximately \$90.00 per migrant). The Army guaranteed repayment of 90 per cent of the loans made to girls coming to Canada under their auspices. Under this agreement with the Federal Department a total of \$134,689.17 was loaned and the Army has repaid the full 90 per cent as agreed to the Department, the last payment being made in March last.

[Lt.-Col. Thomas Tudge.]

We are now finding it difficult to bring this class of settler to Canada through lack of facilities and the various regulations with which the girls and the societies have to comply with, namely medical and civil examinations, about which I shall have something more to say presently.

We made certain proposals to the Department for introducing a number of suitable household workers under the "Reduced Passage Scheme," we undertaking to find suitable situations and to take care of all possible breakdowns. (I submit a memo and certain correspondence submitted to the Minister of Immigration by Commissioner Lamb, which fully explains the position.) At the present time, the only way we can secure the reduced passage for such girls is under the heading of "Descriptive Nominations," and although we have tried hard to work the machine set up, we have found it a very cumbersome and expensive process; for example, this is what was necessary in British Columbia in order to secure the approval of an application for a girl coming forward under the descriptive nomination:—

1. The Voluntary Society must find the prospective employer.
2. The employer completes application form in triplicate.
3. The forms sent in to the local Land Settlement Branch.
4. From the Land Settlement to the Provincial Labour Department to check up.
5. From the Provincial Labour Department back to the Land Settlement.
6. From Land Settlement, Vancouver, to Land Settlement, Ottawa.
7. On to the Supervisor, Women's Department, Ottawa.
8. Application approved or otherwise.
9. Immigration Department, Ottawa, advises Director in London who
10. advises the British Office of the Voluntary Society, who
11. proceeds to find a suitable applicant and submit to Director for approval.

The following memorandum is submitted.

Witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until 4 o'clock p.m.

MEMORANDUM

THE SALVATION ARMY'S MIGRATION AND SETTLEMENT WORK, CANADA

Much has been said about the Army having or desiring to have, preferential treatment as against other philanthropic Societies. It is now said that they are being treated in the same way as all the other Societies. Perhaps so. But has this been achieved by a process of levelling down rather than of levelling up? And is the Army's contention sound when it submits that in this matter the line of approach should be, "Can the Army assist the State rather than that of can the State assist the Army?" Anyhow, the real question for the Minister to consider and to settle is this, and it is three-fold:

- (1) Is it true that the Army in this matter stands alone and in a unique position, by virtue of its organization and ramifications in the Homeland and in Canada, acting under one authority, thus presenting that unity of control so necessary to successful transplantation work, and is, therefore, in a position to render to the State valuable service in this important business?
- (2) Is it a fact that the Army's Department of Migration and Settlement is one not trading for profit, and yet strictly speaking is not a philanthropic or benevolent Society, since it is under no compulsion or obli-

gation to seek an outlet for any inmate of any Institution, but its primary business and sole concern is to seek out and select from the general population men, women and youths for whom they have previously discovered in Canada a need?

(3) In any case, is it worth while the Minister utilizing—

- (a) the experience of 25 years,
- (b) the properties and organization built up in Canada during the last quarter of a century,
- (c) the Army periodicals circulated weekly in hundreds of thousands of homes throughout Canada and the British Isles,
- (d) the other channels of publicity at the Army's disposal,
- (e) properties and organizations scattered throughout the length and breadth of the British Isles?

If so, on what terms and conditions?

Before coming to any conclusion it might be well for the Minister to examine closely, the "machinery" the Army has at its disposal and to consider the Army's record of work.

- (1) the "machinery" the Army has at its disposal, and to consider—
- (2) the Army's record of work.

Take it first from the Canadian end, since the Army from the commencement of its work, has held fast to the fundamental principle that it is the absorbing power of the receiving Country, and not social or economic pressure elsewhere, which must determine the flow of migration.

1. (a) *In the Dominion* the Army has two main Corporations, one for Eastern Canada (Chief Office, Toronto) and one for Western Canada (Chief Office, Winnipeg). From these offices supervision is given through a Territorial Commissioner and a staff of officers to the various ramifications of the organization in the respective territories: Corps (Church): Missioner Stations: Shelters: Homes: Hospitals, etc.

In addition to these Territorial Divisions the Migration and Settlement Department (Chief Office, Montreal) is represented by a Resident Secretary with suitable assistants. The Resident Secretary, whose sole business is Immigration and Settlement, is responsible for the Immigration and Settlement work throughout the whole of the Dominion, and while closely co-operating with the Territorial Commissioners is responsible directly to Migration House in London. In Canada the Immigration and Settlement Staff number 37 officers and 21 employees. The Head Office is in Montreal and Branch Offices are maintained at Halifax; St. John; Quebec; Toronto; Winnipeg and Vancouver. Women's Lodges are established in Moncton; Toronto; London; Winnipeg and Vancouver. Boys' Centres are located at Woodstock and Smith's Falls, Ontario.

The Corps and Social Service Centres number 845, while the officers set apart and devoting their whole time to the work number 1,613. There are also thousands of local officers, handsmen and others, giving freely of their spare time to the work. Each territory published its own *War Cry* and other newspapers.

(b) *In the British Isles* the organization is more complex, since world oversight and training of Officers for International Service are London controlled. The *main* divisions, concerned with work in the British Isles, have officers, reporting to the Chief of Staff, responsible directly to the General and are as follows:—

- (1) The British Field, concerned with the work of Corps (Churches).
- (2) The Training Garrisons.
- (3) The Printing, Publishing and Supplies.

- (4) The Men's Social Work.
- (5) The Women's Social Work.
- (6) The Migration and Settlement Work.
- (7) The Finance, Banking, Property, Fire Insurance, etc.
- (8) The Life Assurance Society.

Centres in the British Isles number 1,634; the Officers (whole time) number 5,772; the Local Officers, Bandsmen, etc. (all teetotalers, non-smokers). number 73,000. The Publications, *The War Cry*, *Young Soldier*, *Bandsman and Songster* (weekly); *The all the World*, *The Officer, Scout and Guard*, and *Warrior*, *The Assurance Journal* (monthly), the *Staff Review* (quarterly), reach a circulation of about 600,000 per issue. All papers are sold except those distributed in hospitals, etc., and circulate in the homes of the people from the Shetlands to the Channel Islands.

The Assurance Society has an income of over £2,000 per day and its Reserve Funds amount to nearly four million pounds sterling (£4,000,000).

2. The Army's record of work shows:—

- (1) A settlement of over 100,000 persons in the Dominion during the past 23 years with a percentage of less than 1 per cent failures of Army-selected Migrants.
- (2) That probably 90 per cent of the business has been created by the Army's own propaganda; while that very propaganda has induced many people to emigrate who have not gone under the Army auspices.
- (3) It has specialized in selecting and settling—
 - (a) Women for Household Service;
 - (b) Men and Youths for Farm work.
- (4) A Repayment to Government (generally speaking) of 90 per cent of money advanced to Army-selected Migrants.

If the Minister is disposed to consider the matter, it would be well for him to briefly examine the history of the relationships of the Army with the Governments of the Dominion. Here are some of the outstanding features:—

- (1) In 1903, the Federal Government and the Ontario Government decided to co-operate closely with the Army by granting money for services rendered and giving facilities for carrying on the work of publicity, selection and transplantation. These arrangements have remained unbroken till this year and have been strengthened from time to time.
- (2) Agreements with the Provincial Governments followed: British Columbia, Manitoba and Nova Scotia particularly having been in co-operation with the Army for many consecutive years; the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Quebec, from time to time.
- (3) The basis of co-operation with the Federal Government at first was a small "flat grant" with a capitation allowance on migrants settled. Then came substantial contributions towards the cost of our London Officers and British Publicity. Later on, in view of objections raised to what was termed "bonused" immigration, the "flat grants" were increased and the bonus abolished. The increased grants were made chiefly towards the maintenance of Reception Lodges for Women, which the Army had in the meanwhile established in various centres in the Dominion.
- (4) Five years ago, on the passing of the Empire Settlement Act, 1922, a five years' agreement was concluded between the Army and the Federal Government. It rested on certain undertakings and it recognized changed and changing conditions—chiefly the post-war increased cost of commodities; the need to re-establish a flow of British migration;

and the desirability of avoiding any suggestion that because the British Government was likely to contribute to cost of the Army's activities, the Federal Government might, for that reason, reduce the amount hitherto given. It was, as a matter of fact, somewhat increased.

The undertakings were that *on the one part* a yearly grant of 25,000 dollars was to be paid by the Government and that *on the other part*, the Army was to maintain certain (named) Reception Lodges for women and render other services. The agreement was not concluded until after Mr. Mackenzie King, the Prime Minister, had been consulted and Commissioner Lamb, on behalf of the Army, had stated he would "take the risk" of any change of Government!

So much for History. What of the future?

The Army suggests:—

- (1) Another 5 years agreement along the lines of that of 5 years ago (as per letter published: see copy extract attached).
- (2) That the Agreement be extended to include Boys for Farm Work who have completed their education.
- (3) That, in view of the recognized "desperate" need for domestic workers in Canada, and the fact that the Army is prepared to accept the full responsibility for the settlement of its selected migrants, it be encouraged in its women's work and have facilities granted for selecting and settling domesticated women, who should have the benefit of the Reduced Passage Rate, subject always to the London Government Director being satisfied that the young women selected by the Army are of good health and character.
- (4) That, having regard to its experience, its organization and equipment, its disinterested services and its reputation in Canada, it is well qualified to undertake this work and as capable as any of the Provincial Governments or either of the Great Railway Corporations of the Dominion.

Migration House,
London, E.C. 4.
9/6/27.

LONDON, Monday, 4th July, 1927.

Dear Mr. WALKER,—Now that the Minister is in London with you might I refer to two matters of which we have spoken from time to time, and to which I hope you can induce Mr. Forke to give his careful consideration while he is here.

- (1) *Domesticated Women*.—I need only make a passing reference to the fact that we have happily transplanted tens of thousands in the past 25 years, and that we have abundant recent evidence that the demand is far from satisfied, and that the supply is by no means exhausted.

I submit for your information a summary of some requests reaching our Officers in Canada during the last few weeks; these applications were unsought so far as we are concerned. What would happen if we went out for business I leave you to imagine! Many of the actual letters are here in my office and the frequent reference to willingness to train is surely in itself ample evidence that an inexperienced girl is looked for. As to the supply, you yourself have some evidence, but I beg to submit particulars of 21 cases not considered eligible for the Reduced Passage Rate, yet domesticated and desirous of engaging in domestic service in Canada.

[Lt.-Col. Thomas Tudge.]

(2) *Publicity in the British Isles.*—In this connection I would refer to my letter of the 24th March, and to the fact that for over 20 years the Federal Government has regularly contributed to our Propaganda Work. You may remember in this connection at my interview with the Minister in Ottawa last December it was thought that in future this aspect of Salvation Army work could perhaps best be considered by the Director of Migration in London.

Will you now give me the opportunity I ask for, of submitting to you some evidences of our work, ideas and schemes.

Trusting you are well.

I am,

Yours very truly,

DAVID C. LAMB,

Commissioner.

J. BRUCE WALKER, Esq.,

Director of European Migration to Canada,

The Canadian Building,

Trafalgar Square, S.W. 1.

4th July, 1927.

SUMMARY OF 127 APPLICATIONS RECENTLY RECEIVED FOR DOMESTIC HELP AT OUR DOMESTIC LODGES IN CANADA

District	—	Inexperienced Generals	Mother's Help	Cook	General	Wages Offered
Moncton.....	10	2	1	7	\$15-25-30
Toronto.....	34	23	1	10	\$25-35
Winnipeg.....	52	18	2	13	19	\$20-35
Vancouver.....	31	3	4	24	\$25-35 Generals \$35-40 Cooks
	127	43	7	17	60	

FOR INFORMATION OF THE HON. ROBERT FORKE

Samples of cases of Domesticated Women (British) desirous of emigrating to Canada but who are considered by the Government's Official in the United Kingdom, *not* eligible for the Reduced Passage Rates.

In each case submitted, health was considered to be satisfactory (in some instances, the usual Medical Certificate had been actually secured) and moral character unimpeachable. As to Domestic experience, these girls, although not in actual household service, were able to undertake plain cooking and general housework, and, in most instances, also to undertake washing.

Our Regd. Number	Name	District	Age	Work engaged in	Religion	Remarks
B.1581	Annie Cochrane.....	Belfast.....	23	Mill worker.....	Presbyterian.....	Canadian Government says 24/3/27: "She appears to be a very good type—would recommend her for admission as a full paying passenger. Please advise if you are prepared to make this loan towards fare."
B.1597	Ellen Gibson.....	Belfast.....	24	Spoke stitcher....	Presbyterian.....	Canadian Government says 30/3/27: "We find this girl is an industrial worker and we are therefore unable to recommend her for the reduced fare—please advise if you are prepared to make her a loan of the fare."
G.6433	Sarah Hassall.....	Gournock...	21	Shop assistant....	Roman Catholic...	Eldest of family of 11. Reference says: "Having trained a few girls in service—can vouch for her domestic abilities." Canadian Government says: "Cannot recommend as she has been a shop assistant since leaving school. Therefore necessary to pay full fare or obtain a loan of the passage money."
B.1596	Susan Gibson.....	Belfast.....	30	Spoke stitcher....	Presbyterian.....	Minister says: "For ordinary housework most competent." Other reference says: "Can cook and wash."
G.4824	Elizabeth Petrie....	Dundee.....	21	Mill worker.....	Church of Scotland.	Had some experience. Canadian Government say: "Recommend this girl be permitted to go forward under full passage loan."
B. 1597	Susan Crossley.....	Belfast.....	21	Weaver.....	Church of Ireland...	Home experience. Domestic work and assistant. Waitress 1923-4. Government say: "Recommend if you loan passage."
L.2081	Gertrude Orme.....	Burnley.....	29	Mill worker (4 years).	Church of England..	Domestic work 3 months. Can cook, wash and do housework. Canadian Government say: "She has been employed in mill past four years, therefore not eligible for the reduced passage fare."
L.1394	Florence Smith.....	Kendal.....	21	Cook.....	Church of England..	Cook. Past six months £52 per year. Cooks for 40 people at Grammar School. References good. Medical certificate good. Canadian Government say: "Unable to give reduced passage." (Waited 6 months for interview with Canadian Government).
L.2066	Gladys Dunn.....	Oldham....	18	Mill worker (18 months).	Church of England..	Previously employed domestic work. Government say: "Cannot recommend as she has been employed in the mill since September 1925."
G.6229	Elizabeth Taylor...	Gournock...	19	Textile worker....	Presbyterian.....	Kept house for father since mother died four years ago, after returning from mill in the evening. Younger sister now doing this. Canadian government say: "Not eligible as she is a factory worker."
B.1529	Martha Davis.....	Killyleigh..	20	Mill worker.....	Church of Ireland...	Ref. says: "Smart, honest, willing—16 months capacity as nurse, also assisted in the house: Could do plain cooking. Canadian government say: "Not prepared to recommend for reduced fare."

[Lt.-Col. Thomas Tudge.]

Our Regd. Number	Name	District	Age	Work engaged in	Religion	Remarks
G.6406	Mary Paton.....	Dundee.....	18	Callander worker.	Free Church.....	Ref.:—Mother's help nine months 1923-4. General housework but no cooking. Left to earn more money, as her father was dead. Government say: "Cannot recommend for reduced passage. Immature and lacking in neatness." The mother states she has applied under your Widows' Scheme. Perhaps if she and the rest of the family can be approved this girl might be included in the arrangements for them.
G.5684	Elizabeth Havern..	Dumbarton	22	Unemployed previously domestic.	Church of Scotland.	Ref.: For 12 months domestic work. Declined by Canadian Government, as the reference suggested dishonesty. Girl denies this and stated her employer was 'moody' and could not keep servants. He had 4 cooks in 12 months. She left to better herself.
G.5433	Elizabeth Mitchells.	St. Andrews	19	Laundry worker.	Baptist.....	Kept house for 2 years. Government say: "Recommend that she be allowed to proceed under loan of full passage from you."
G.6434	Janet McDevitt....	Glasgow....	22	Shop assistant....	Protestant.....	Employed 2 years domestic. Government say: "Unable recommend reduced rate. Please state if you wish this case dealt with under full Form F."
G.5420	Elizabeth Mudie....	Dundee.....	23	Jute preparer.....	Roman Catholic....	Ref. says: "First class cook, and her work bears the hallmark of efficiency. He has known her 7 years. Canadian Government say: "Recommend she be allowed to proceed with a full loan from you of passage money."
G.6225	Rosetta Revell....	Gournock...	18	Housemaid.....	Church of England..	Reference says: "Tidy, clever, hardworking girl." J. P. says: "known her since childhood and recommends. Another ref. says: "Thoroughly competent." Canadian Government say: "Absolutely untrained, unmannerly and should have 6 months domestic work."
H.O.5586	Ada Flint.....	Birmingham.	33	Rubber worker..	Church of England..	Can cook and wash. Has been responsible for their home since losing mother 6 years ago.
H.O.9005	Emma Flint (Sister of above)	Birmingham.	23	Rubber worker..	Church of England..	Can wash and cook. Canadian Government: "These are particularly nice girls; very honest and straightforward in all they say, and they told me they are not domestics in the ordinary sense. Their personal characters are so good, and they have clearly had domestic experience at home, that I shall certainly recommend them to you if they are nominated."
G.6872	Elizabeth Martin..	Clydebank.	18	Dressmaker.....	United Free Church	Mother who is a widow, aged 41 and also an applicant for migration says of her two daughters: Both girls are good plain cooks and good clean houseworkers, and willing to take domestic work.
G.6871	Janet Martin.....	Clydebank.	20	Shop asst.....	United Free Church	Government say their recommendation would not get them the reduced passage as they have never been in domestic work.

Copy

THE CANADIAN BUILDING,
TRAFALGAR SQUARE,
LONDON, S.W. 1,

July 6, 1927.

DEAR COMMISSIONER LAMB,—

I have your letter of the 4th July, enclosing some documents dealing with—

- (a) Domesticated women, and
- (b) Publicity in the British Isles.

As the Minister and the Deputy Minister are at the moment in Europe, I think it would be advisable that I should submit these papers direct to them without any special comment beyond what may arise in the course of a discussion or conversation on the subject.

I am sending Mr. Forke (awaiting his arrival back from Scandinavia) a copy of your letter to me of the 4th July, and the originals of the forms enclosed therewith.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) J. BRUCE WALKER,
Director.

Commissioner D. C. LAMB,
The Salvation Army,
Migration House,
3 Upper Thames street,
London, E.C. 4.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Committee resumed at 4 p.m.

Lt.-Col. THOMAS TUDGE recalled.

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee. in the matter of publicity and propaganda both in Great Britain and Canada, the Army is in a peculiar position to render invaluable Service.

The Army owns in Great Britain 9 periodicals (3 weekly, 5 monthly, and 1 quarterly). The weekly and monthly enjoy a very large circulation among the working class population of the community. It has been our practise to carry on through this medium a steady campaign which reaches the "emigrating classes". A Publicity section of the Department is maintained, through which at intervals helpful articles and information are supplied to the British press, which, is invariably willing to have the Army's viewpoints on the various problems arising.

Then too, for many years during the winter months lecture campaigns have played a prominent part in our program. Special experienced officers have been sent from Canada to Great Britain to visit selected districts, to recruit and select suitable emigrants.

From the early days of the Department we have enjoyed the hearty approval of the Federal Government and have worked in close co-operation with the various officials. With the Governments of Ontario and British Columbia we have had an unbroken record of co-operation for over 20 years and with the other Provincial Governments for a shorter period.

The various Federal Ministers have been pleased to utilize the Organization and make grants in aid for work accomplished. Now, however, I am afraid the

[Lt.-Col. Thomas Tudge.]

policy is to restrict the activities of the Voluntary Societies,—not perhaps intentionally to discriminate against the Salvation Army,—but because the Department apparently is of opinion that the Government's own Organization is all-sufficient and can do all the work. I submit here a memo. dated November 24, 1927, to the Prime Minister by Commissioner Lamb which clearly sets out the position, so far as the Army is concerned. (See memorandum at page 492.)

I respectfully submit it is not possible for the departmental organization to do what we are doing. At least 90 per cent of the business we handle is created by us and the people would not come to Canada in any other way. The majority of the people who come through us do so because of the reputation we have built up both here and overseas, and many of the parents will only agree to their young people coming to Canada when they are sure that there is someone in the new country, apart from the Government, who will "look after them". By virtue of our unity of control there is no doubt that the promises made to migrants in the Old Country are carried out on arrival here.

Medical Examination

We have no doubts about the desirability and necessity of medical examination. As a matter of fact right from our early days we have required a medical certificate from people to whom we have made loans on account of passage. We acted for many years on the medical certificate of the family doctor, which we found worked admirably. When the Roster Doctor system was introduced by the Government we accepted the same, and on the whole the results were quite satisfactory.

In regard to the regulations which came into effect this year in the British Isles, it is early yet to pass a considered judgment on the same, but it would appear that they have something to do with retarding the flow of intended settlers. The present medical regulation is particularly hard on young women and farm workers living in the country districts. It is very often impossible for the intended migrants to get to the interviewing centre at the appointed time (which of course must necessarily be fixed for the convenience of the doctor). Moreover, many of the centres are not particularly attractive to young women, it is true that licensed premises have been withdrawn but such places as town halls, council chambers, shipping agents offices, drill halls, etc., are still being used.

Another aspect which should not be overlooked is the publicity given to the applicants intention to migrate, by their having to attend at public places where the Government Doctor is advertised to visit. Hitherto the business could be conducted quite privately. Many young women are not very happy about being examined by a strange doctor.

The securing of the necessary photos, while presenting no difficulty to town dwellers, is often a very difficult proposition for people living in country districts, since it means that a special journey has to be taken to secure the photos—making two journeys for medical purposes, entailing at times considerable expense.

The idea underlying the new regulations is good, namely the finality of the examination, but I would remind the Committee that after the migrants have been examined by the Government Doctor they are not allowed to embark before passing the British Board of Trade and the Shipping Company doctors, hence they are liable to rejection at the ship's side.

(Lt.-Col. Thomas Tudge.)

Civil Examination

All applicants for the reduced passage must, under the present regulations, be interviewed by an officer of the Canadian Government, quite apart from the medical examination. This often entails another journey to a distant centre, and as in the case of the medical examination this, I am afraid will retard the migration of a very desirable class, namely women for domestic service and farm workers living in distant country districts.

The young woman usually depends upon the pleasure of her employer for special "time off" as in most cases girls do not desire to inform their employers of their intention to migrate until she is sure that she will be accepted, and it is not always an easy matter for a girl to excuse herself for at least two and a half days off. This means that in many cases the applicant fails to attend the necessary interview and her case is cancelled.

In regard to families living in country districts it is often difficult to collect the whole family together on a given date, and unless the family can be examined as a whole it is useless for the individual members to present themselves.

The constant checking up on the migrant has another effect on the societies concerned in preparing case papers. Hitherto the Voluntary Society has felt that its reputation was at stake on each migrant but now the society feels that the onus cannot be placed upon it.

Each of these items taken separately may appear trivial, but taken collectively they assume great proportions to the people concerned and undoubtedly turn desirable people's attention to other parts of the Empire where such restrictions are not imposed. As far as our experience is concerned the following figures will show the way matters are moving,—for the year 1926-27, 47 per cent came to Canada, 39 per cent to Australia, 14 per cent to other countries; for year 1927-28, 40 per cent came to Canada, 45 per cent to Australia, 15 per cent to other countries.

In conclusion may I say that the Salvation Army seeks no undue preference. All we do in this matter of great importance is to place the services of this unique organization at the disposal of the Government and ask for it to be utilized to the fullest extent.

In the question of grants we only ask for financial aid for well tried work done, and not for experiments. We would urge that whatever is done, it should not be in the levelling down or the restricting of our activities.

I submit for the consideration of the Committee the following suggestions as a contribution to the solution of the very important and far reaching question:—

(1) *Single Men:*

If the Dominion is anxious to secure men for agricultural work, we believe that they can be found in the British Isles. They cannot, however, be drawn from the rural districts, as it is well known that the active farming class is scarce in the Old Country.

There are, nevertheless, thousands of young men between the ages of 21-25 who are willing to undertake farm work in Canada if they are given the necessary guarantee of continuous employment.

In order to test the men as to their suitability and capability we would suggest that large Training Camps be established throughout *Great Britain* (rather than in Canada because of the short season) where a short intensive training could be given. Good results have been obtained in the experiments made, and now the time has come when the scheme should be looked at seriously on a big scale.

[Lt.-Col. Thomas Tudge.]

(4) *Standard of Fitness:*

In regard to the standard of fitness, we advocate that there should be one standard, i.e. a capacity to earn one's living, and that no matter who provides the cost of passage, the facilities for entry should be the same.

Since the war, there is a new class of poor in Great Britain, and people who had no need in the old days to seek charity are compelled to do so to-day—but, they would much prefer to accept the cost of their passage to an Oversea Dominion to a place where work awaits them, than be forced to accept weekly doles at home with no prospect at the end.

The safeguards to Canada would be deportation if a person became a public charge within the first five years of settlement.

(3) *Cheaper Fares:*

“Would we advocate cheaper fares?”

To this question we would undoubtedly answer “Yes”, but a great deal would depend upon what would be termed “cheaper fares”. If the ocean rate of £10 is thought of, we would venture the opinion that such a rate would not make very much difference. Whilst \$50 is not very much to a man in Canada, the working class man in the Old Country who has £10 in his pocket may be looked upon as being in a comfortable way and not likely to wish to move.

We would suggest a flat rate of £5 for single people and £10 for a family, with an obligation of having £2 landing money for single people and £5 for a family from the 1st March to 1st September, the landing money to be increased as from 1st September to £10 for a single man and £25 for a family.

To sum up I would advocate:—

1. That immigration should be handled by a commission outside of politics.
2. That there should be a definite five- to ten-year program laid down.
3. That all approved societies engaged in migration work should be enlisted and encouraged to increase and extend the work in their own particular field, especially as at the moment recruiting in Great Britain is difficult, and each society would have a different appeal to various people.
4. That financial aid be given approved societies to assist with training and testing farms in Great Britain for the training of intended migrants, and for aftercare work in Canada.
5. That the full responsibility for placing, supervising and aftercare should be placed on the shoulders of the society or agency responsible for introducing settlers, subject of course to Government supervision of the society.
6. That assisted passages under the Empire Settlement Act be given to all women, of good character and physically fit, who will agree to enter domestic work on arrival in Canada and who come through responsible societies.
7. That assisted passages, under the Act, be given to all classes who will undertake to engage in farm work on arrival in Canada who come through a society or agency who will accept responsibility for placing, etc.
8. That reduced passages be afforded to families joining husbands already settled in the Dominion, irrespective of the nature of his work.

It has been stated by someone that each British settler is worth at least \$5,000 to this country; if this is so, then surely it will pay Canada well to secure as many suitable people as the Salvation Army can possibly bring in. In pre-war days it was much easier for people to enter than at present, and while we desire to see that the *quality* is right yet, we should not forget that we must also

have quantity if we desire to see this country grow and develop and keep it British for future generations yet unborn.

I thank you, gentlemen.

Memorandum referred to by witness at page 489 follows:—

MONTREAL, November 24, 1927.

The Rt. Hon. W. MACKENZIE KING, P.C.,
Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

The Salvation Army Migration and Settlement
Department.

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER,—Following on my conversation with you on the 12th instant, I saw the Minister (the Hon. R. Forke) and I now beg to submit for your information and consideration the enclosed memo. I have stated our case as concisely as possible. The question is quite a complex one, and if there is any point upon which you desire further information, our Montreal Office will know where to find me.

I leave here to-night but expect (D.V.) to return on Wednesday for a day or two before I leave for England. Meanwhile I am quietly trying to raise some money towards the maintenance of our Lodges in Canada and to select and train a few hundred boys for farmers in the Dominion.

Before leaving Ottawa I assured Mr. Forke that we will do our best to work the "machine" he is creating, although it appears to me to be very cumbersome. The fact that no grant is being made in the current fiscal year, and only \$5,000 promised for 1928-29, at a time when we were preparing to extend our work, will of course prove a serious handicap.

With all good wishes for the coming year.

Believe me,

Yours faithfully,

DAVID C. LAMB,
Commissioner.

P.S.—I have just been examining the records of 523 boys brought into the Dominion in 1926 and find that only 5 have been deported and 18 have for various reasons returned home with our concurrence and help. Of the 500 remaining I find that nearly 90 per cent are on farms after an average of 18 months in the country. This is not too bad.

Memorandum

ANENT THE SALVATION ARMY MIGRATION AND SETTLEMENT WORK AND
GOVERNMENT RELATIONSHIPS

MONTREAL, November 20, 1927.

- I. Historical Survey.
- II. Present Position.
- III. Suggestions.

I. Historical Survey: It is over 24 years since the Salvation Army established in the Dominion a Department of Migration and Settlement. During that period it has selected in Europe and happily settled in Canada

[Lt.-Col. Thomas Tudge.]

tens of thousands of migrants, creating 90 per cent of the business it has handled. For this work it has opened a chain of Reception Lodges and organized and trained a staff of officers and workers.

The percentage of failures amongst the migrants has been comparatively small—certainly less than the general average.

Since its inception, the Federal Government have continuously used the organization of the Salvation Army for: (1) Publicity and selection, and (2) Reception and Settlement. For the five-year period ended 31st March last the Government contributed at the rate of \$25,000 per annum for these purposes. The Army undertook to maintain five Lodges during the five years in question—as a matter of fact they maintained seven for four years. Until last year the relationships between the Government Department and the Army have been uniformly most cordial. In the fall of 1926, however, an acute controversy developed over the question of boys repaying the Army out of their wages some part of the cost of their transplantation. The Department objected to any recoveries. The Army contended strongly for the application of one of their fundamental principles, viz., beneficiaries of their ministrations paying or repaying some part of the cost of the services rendered. The Army's point in respect of the boys was that there was a considerable expenditure in training and outfitting towards which the Government of Canada contributed nothing. The Army's contention ultimately prevailed. An agreement has now been arrived at as to the amount to be recovered and the period over which recoveries shall be spread.

At the end of the fiscal year (31st March, 1927) the grants to the Salvation Army stopped; the Government Department having come to the conclusion that they now had their own organization established; that other societies were asking for grants the same as the Army were getting and that the only solution lay in refusing *all* grants.

The Army has not and does not seek any preference. It has always first experimented and demonstrated at its own cost, and then, as now, suggested that it is in a position to offer services—somewhat unique—which any Government might profitably engage and pay for—on results. When the grants were stopped the Government arranged to pay, in normal circumstances, one dollar in the East and one dollar and fifty cents in the West for each girl we received and placed through our Lodges, and for each boy under 17 years of age, trained at Hadleigh and settled in Canada, a payment of ten dollars. The payment on account of women is one made to all Lodges operated by voluntary societies in the Dominion, but *some Lodges (none of ours) are placed on a much more favourable basis.*

II. Present Position (November, 1927).

The Minister of Immigration and Colonization confirms in effect the decisions previously arrived at, viz:—

- I. To discontinue to use the Salvation Army periodicals, etc., for publicity propaganda work in the Old Country.
- II. To discontinue making any contributions towards the maintenance of the Seven Reception Lodges of the Army in the various parts of the Dominion devoted exclusively for the reception of newcomers. (Mr. Forke has, however, kindly promised a grant of five thousand dollars (\$5,000) for our General Migration and Settlement work).

These decisions were arrived at after it was pointed out that it looked like discrimination against the Army since—

(a) the Government was contributing to Lodges maintained by other voluntary Societies—most if not all of which had come into operation *after* the Salvation Army had established their Lodges.

(b) Three of the Seven Army Lodges in question were located in centres where there were neither Government or voluntary Societies at work.

(c) In Vancouver, B.C. (where nearly 20 years ago the Army built and still maintains a fine commodious and comfortable Hostel used exclusively for the reception of new arrivals), the Government had classed the Y.W.C.A. rooms in that city as the *Government Hostel*: placing it on a different footing to the Salvation Army Hostel, which, without respect to creed or nationality, has, during the past twenty years, received and placed in that province, hundreds of young women—more than all the other voluntary Societies put together.

In view of the foregoing I felt that we had had a “raw deal” and I told the Minister so: that I proposed submitting the whole question to the Prime Minister; pointing out that we are not prepared at present to “scrap” this “machine”—carefully built up during the past 24 years; that if we were going on with the work we would require money to maintain these Lodges and organizations. I thought it only fair before making any public appeal that the Prime Minister should have the opportunity of reviewing the whole matter, and of considering a suggestion I had made which seemed to me to have within it the germ of settlement of the difficulties confronting the Minister in relation to the work of his Department, and that of outside organizations (a) trading for profit and (b) those not trading for profit.

III. Suggestions:

I submit the following suggestions:—

I. Reception and aftercare work in Canada.

(1) Offer to approved Societies undertaking the aftercare, and who maintain Lodges devoted exclusively to reception and aftercare of new arrivals, \$1,000 p.a. on the first 50 (40 to be a qualifying minimum) and twenty-five dollars (\$25.00) per adult migrant (children in proportion) for every migrant (conditions of approval to be suitable premises, conveniently situated, publication of audited accounts yearly and necessary staff).

(2) As an alternative—(a) Give us for each of our seven (7) Lodges we have been operating for years—\$3,000 p.a. (while we maintain numbers approximately to the average of the last 2 years), or (b) agree to contribute 50 per cent of the approved cost of operating our Lodges with certain limits as per migrant and in total—or (c) give us the same treatment that you are giving the so-called Government Lodges. (I don't know what this (c) means but I'll risk it).

NOTE.—Under the passage Agreement the Federal Government is obligated to spend approximately thirty dollars (\$30.00) on the aftercare of migrants receiving the reduced passage rates, and aftercare payments to approved Societies would only be made on account of such

II.

PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA THROUGH S.A. IN BRITISH ISLES

Reconsider the question of the use and value of the Salvation Army in the British Isles as a publicity propaganda medium.

The foregoing is governed by principles which are applicable to any and every kind of voluntary Society or business concern. I venture to think that their acceptance by the Government would go a long way to secure the hearty co-operation of all the organizations engaged in Migration and Settlement work whether working for profit or otherwise. Surely as there is no apparent limit to the supply and demand for settlement it would be a good business to "harness" all the reputable organizations and encourage them so long as they fulfilled the reasonable obligations which naturally follow an undertaking to carry on propaganda in desirable districts, and to give proper care to new arrivals. If the Government is under obligation to spend a certain sum for after-care of persons qualified to receive the reduced passage rates surely any organization finding persons qualified for such concessions and undertaking to perform to the satisfaction of the Government that after-care, the Society should be paid an amount equal to the whole of the Government's aftercare liability (or nearly the whole of it) even if the Government itself may have the machinery available for the work, but in point of fact does *not* do the work.

In this connection and in conclusion, this simple fact stands out in our Aftercare Agreements recently concluded with the British Government, and in which they agree (with certain limits per migrant) to contribute 50 per cent of the approved cost of aftercare, that they require us to show, in Canada, an expenditure of Five Pounds (£5) per migrant before *they* can come in on the 50-50 basis.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: It is in order now for any member of the Committee to ask questions, if he wishes.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. I have one or two questions, Mr. Chairman. In regard to the Salvation Army's work in bringing out boys or children; you received a certain grant from the Government, did you not, which was later cut off?—A. No, not direct to boys. A grant was made to the boys' passage.

Q. From the Government to the Army?—A. To the boy, sir.

Q. A grant was made from the Government to the boy for his passage, was that it?—A. Yes. In the case of boys under seventeen the grant was \$80 towards a free passage.

Q. Am I right in stating that the Army had an arrangement with boys in bringing them out by which they were to pay back to the Army a certain amount?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And because of that arrangement your right to bring those boys out was cut off by the Government?—A. For a time, yes, sir.

Q. For how long?—A. I think nearly all of last year, sir.

Q. Do I understand that you have back again the right which you formerly had?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you are carrying on on the conditions on which you formerly carried on?—A. Except as to the collection of the loan.

Q. You do not make collection of the loan?—A. Yes, sir, we have an agreement now that it must be limited now to \$25, but that is not money that is paid for passage; it is in connection with the training of the boys on the farm colony in Hadleigh and also with the outfitting and certain after-care which

[Lt.-Col. Thomas Tudge.]

we undertake to do in this country, which no other society does. That has nothing whatever to do with the passage.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. How much did you formerly collect from the boys?—A. It was according to the zone. We had the country zoned. For instance the passage money did not carry a boy to British Columbia; it was not sufficient; and we divided the country into zones and set a rate for each zone, and it was claimed that a certain hardship was imposed upon the boy because one was paying for the other. In fact the whole thing was pooled, but it was all spent upon the boys.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Am I right in saying that the Government took exception to that plan of yours?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As handicapping the boys?—A. Yes.

Q. And because of that, they shut down on that kind of work for a time?—A. Unless we would give up the system, sir.

Q. Then do I understand that the Government has changed their attitude in regard to that and that they now permit you to go ahead as you formerly did and take back from the boy, or have the boy pay back a part of the cost of his training?—A. Yes, up to a sum of \$25.

Q. The Government accepts that principle now to which they formerly objected?—A. And that must be repaid within the first eight or nine months of the boy's arrival. If he does not pay that it is cancelled.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Will you just explain the arrangement in regard to that \$25?—A. If you do not mind I think I had better ask my friend here to do that as he is more conversant with the whole system possibly than what I am.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: That will be satisfactory.

Mr. CAHAN: If the Colonel has not this information, why should he not complete his evidence first, and then his friend may be called.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I would like his answer.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: The witness has said that he is not familiar with the situation and has asked his confrere to answer for him: I think in the interest of getting the information in order it would be wise to allow his confrere to make his statement. They are here on the same subject:

Mr. CAHAN: I should like to ask the witness a question before he stands down.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Very well.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Is the witness conversant with the recent system of medical examination in England, from personal knowledge and observation?—A. No, sir, not from personal knowledge. I have not been in England since this matter has been introduced and I have got my information from correspondence with the other side. That is how I am informed.

Q. I do not know whether that is evidence that is quite acceptable, but I would like to know this: is it a fact that places are set for the examination of intending emigrants which are unsuitable and unattractive in this sense, that these places are sometimes public houses to which women object to go?—A. Not at the present time, sir; I said those had been withdrawn.

Q. How long since?—A. That I am not prepared to say. I saw a list here last year, last fall; the first list issued; in which I counted seven or eight hotels, mentioned on that particular list as places of examination.

Q. Unfortunately, your information is not direct. I was told within a week by a gentleman from England that at the present time women were asked to go to public houses, and in some cases to insane asylums, and in other cases to places equally unsuitable, and that they objected to go to these places; they objected to be seen going into or coming out of them. Do you know anything about that?—A. I personally have no knowledge of it, but my friend here, who has just arrived from the Old Country, can give you some information on that particular point if you wish.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: He may be called.

Staff-Capt. OWEN CULSHAW, called.

The WITNESS: My official position with the Salvation Army is Private Secretary to Commissioner Lamb; and also I am in charge of the London Office of the Salvation Army Emigration Department.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Will you explain that boy situation, because I would like the Committee to have the whole facts of the case?—A. The boy situation as I understand is that in the year 1922, just after the passing of the Empire Settlement Act, Commissioner Lamb came to Ottawa and put certain proposals before the then Acting Minister of Immigration. Right in the forefront of the proposals was the fact that the boys would be expected to repay part of the passage money, or part of the cost of their transplantation rather. A scheme was agreed on and I think the first one that went through was that there would be a grant of \$40 and a loan of \$90, which would be put up in part by the Canadian Government. That was agreed to and worked for the first few months in 1923, and a settlement made with the Canadian Government, the cost being to them, as far as loans were concerned, a matter of \$3,000. Then the negotiations took a turn and the Government came in further with child immigration, making a grant of \$80 on account of each child. The history of the thing is rather complicated; it starts away back before the war, if I may be permitted to digress for a moment. The Government were making grants to child immigration societies.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. How old?—A. Up to fourteen years of age. Below fourteen years of age at first, and then it was increased. A grant of, I think, first of all about \$2.50. It was then increased to \$10 per head, but the society must bring in a minimum of 100 children. If it dropped below the minimum, then there was no grant made whatsoever. Matters progressed and then the Department came in with a grant of \$40 for children between the ages of fourteen and seventeen years of age. Then again another step forward, the grant was increased to \$80. I would like you to notice, gentlemen, that the grant was always made to the society and not to the child.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. That is different from the Colonel's statement, is it not?—A. He has said, I think, that he was not quite up to dealing with this part, but I will do the best I can.

Q. You must admit that that is a matter in dispute?—A. Well, I have given my version of it, Mr. Forke.

Q. And we have had other versions. The Colonel agreed with me—A. I will ask the Colonel if he will withdraw his statement, if that is possible.

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

Colonel TUDGE: Certainly.

The WITNESS: We have always understood—I can make the definite statement—it has always been in our minds and it was built up on the facts of the case, that the first grant was given to the society; when it was increased it was still to the society and we took it for granted that the further grants were made to the society. The boy scheme which was brought into being in the Old Country, was not only one for Canada but one for the whole of the Empire, and we found funds in the Old Country to help out with this work, and to make the scheme go as far as possible we pooled all the money which we received from all sources: the \$80 grant from the Canadian Government, certain grants from the Australian Government; the New Zealand Government; and from the British Government; and from subscribers in the Old Country; and it then came that we had to find a deficit.

No matter what department we are engaged in, one of the principles which governs the work of the Salvation Army is that the beneficiaries of our administration must pay something towards the cost of the efforts made on their behalf. We take it as a matter of principle that it is a good thing, especially with these young fellows, a good thing for the boy; it helps his self-respect and makes him more self-reliant in the days to come. We went along those lines. Whether we were right or wrong we thought the grant was to the society and pooled all our resources.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. While you were getting that \$80 from the Government on each boy, what were you asking the boy to repay to you for the training which you had given him?—A. It depended on the part of Canada to which he went, but in no case was it more than \$100 at the outside, but whatever the boy paid in England before he left was taken off the amount he was asked to repay in Canada. That is to say that some boys could not find anything; some boys could find as much as £8 or £10; that was taken off, we will say \$100. It was taken off the \$100 before he was asked to pay anything.

Q. So that the amount would vary?—A. The amount would vary according to what amount the boy paid in England but the basic amount was always the same; if he went to the Maritime Provinces he would pay a less zone amount. The zone amounts were £18 for British Columbia, £16 for the prairie provinces, £14 for Ontario and £12 for the Maritime Provinces.

Q. That is from the boy?—A. Yes, from the boy.

Q. How long a time was that spread over?—A. That payment was spread over a period of two years. But, I would like you to mark this, that if for any reason whatsoever the boy did not pay the amount within the two years, it was wiped out, and he was not asked for it at all. There must have been some good reason why the boy did not pay, and the thing was wiped right out.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. The money was paid by the farmer to the Salvation Army?—A. Under the agreement, which we must take up in accordance with the departmental regulations, we look after the boy's money, and put it to his account, and, under the agreement with the boy, signed before he went away, half his wages would go towards liquidating his liability, and the other half would be put to his account.

Q. Then, do you think there is any truth in the statement made by a good many boys that they thought they were repaying back their passage money.—A. I do not think there is any truth in it at all. We had no information whatsoever until recently—

Q. Well, suppose this Department were able to show you fifteen or twenty letters stating that they did not know what they signed, and that they thought they were repaying back their passage money, would you believe it then?—A. I would like to hear the other side first; I would like to see the letters.

Q. If the boy thought he was repaying back his passage money, if he said so, would you believe him? Why would you doubt the boy?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I think that is a perfectly reasonable position for the witness to take.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: These boys have said they thought they were repaying back the passage money.

Mr. CAHAN: I think these letters should be produced.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: We can produce the letters.

WITNESS: If you would also produce what led up to the letters being written.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: That is not unfair.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I have no objection to that.

WITNESS: I can positively state that we had no difficulty with the boys whatsoever about the repayment of these amounts until we heard from the department regarding it.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Because our officers found out that these boys thought they were repaying their passage money.

WITNESS: I might explain the system we had with the boys when the statement was signed. The boys are brought to our farm colony for training, Hadleigh, Essex, and while there, we have experienced officers with them all the time, and a special officer comes down from the Migration Department and explains the whole scheme to the boy, just as I am explaining it to you now, and tells him exactly what he is going to do, and what he is asked to repay. We have never asked the boy to repay any of the amount of his passage.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Does the boy understand that you are asking him to repay a certain amount of the money you have spent on him, in order that by so doing he may help some other boy?—A. Absolutely; there is no doubt of that whatsoever.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Why do you think the boys would sign a statement?—A. The boys, before they leave the Old Country, when they sign the documents, understand what they are doing. I have no reason to doubt their intelligence.

Q. Then you cannot reconcile the two things. We will produce those letters where the boys say they understood that they were repaying their passage money.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. How many cases?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: My Deputy tells me at least fifteen.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. How many boys did you bring out?—A. We sent 2,050 boys up to the end of last year.

Discussion followed.

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

WITNESS: The position of affairs led up, on October 4th, to a letter being received by our headquarters in London stating that unless we ceased to collect the money from those boys, by promise or otherwise, we could not continue in this work of migration. At that time, we had about 80 boys on our farm colony at Hadleigh, who had been promised to go to Canada, subject to Government permission. We were practically committed to that. We had brought them from their homes, and we appealed, asking that judgment might be stayed until Commissioner Lamb had an opportunity of making personal representations to the Minister on the business. However, the embargo held, and these boys were left on the farm there, left on our hands. Negotiations were taken up with the British Government, and through their good offices, it is now being arranged that the boys will repay the sum of \$25 as a voluntary contribution towards the work that the Army is doing on their behalf.

So that there will be no misunderstanding in the future, we now give to each boy a statement showing exactly in each individual case what it has cost to send him to Canada, what he has paid, and what he is asked to repay. The agreement to contribute is not only signed by the boy, but is also signed by his parent, or guardian, on his behalf, and the boys that are now coming to Canada are coming on those conditions.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: If you were thoroughly familiar with this thing, you would be able to tell the tale completely. Will you allow me to explain the negotiations. I met Commissioner Lamb in London and made an arrangement with him that the Salvation Army would be allowed to bring forward these boys, and have them repay \$25, on the understanding, and agreement that when they signed these papers either their parents or their guardians would also be there and sign the papers along with the boys.

WITNESS: I have just said that, sir.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I beg your pardon, I did not hear that.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Was your statement involving this repayment accepted by the Governments of Australia and New Zealand?—A. Without hesitation.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. What does it cost to bring a boy out?—A. We reckon it costs us on an average £48 per boy. That is, taking in the training, outfitting, and transportation, £48 per boy. Of course, costs are varying every day, but that is the average cost.

Q. That is about \$240 a boy?—A. Yes, \$240 a boy.

Q. Or \$250 a boy?

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. You said that these boys were acquainted with the plan involving the repayment of a part of the cost of training and preparation. Did any of the boys object to that plan before sailing?—A. None whatever, sir. As a matter of fact, when the boy makes his application to us to go to Canada, in the first papers we send to him is a little booklet, a comprehensive booklet, which I can supply the Committee with, if necessary, in which it is noted in the forefront that part of the money spent on his behalf he will be requested to pay on it. It is right in the forefront, before he signs any forms, or anything at all.

Q. Did your officers, at any time to your knowledge, report that they found that Government inspectors were suggesting to these boys that they were repaying to the Salvation Army money which the governments had already paid for

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

their passage? Did any of your officers, at any time to your knowledge, report anything of that kind?—A. They reported that the boys had told them that the inspectors had suggested that to them.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. How many boys did you send to Brandon the year before last, when you were getting the grant?—A. The grant from where?

Q. To Manitoba, I mean?—A. The grant from where, sir?

Q. Previous to that year? The grant was shut off for one year. But the year previous to that, and last year, how many boys did you send to Manitoba?—A. You mean the \$80 grant?

Q. Yes.—A. Answering your question, last year we sent no boys.

Q. Yes, but the year before that?—A. The year before that we sent no boys.

Q. Why?—A. First of all—

Q. I say Manitoba?—A. Brandon was our centre. There was a complication of circumstances there. First of all, we opened Brandon Lodge, because we thought the Government were going to come in and help us with this after-care work, and the cost of it.

Q. You mean the Manitoba Government?—A. No, the Federal Government. No grant was made, therefore, it was too expensive for us to keep up. That was one reason. The second reason was on account of the Provincial Act which was brought into force, which made it necessary for the Provincial Government to inspect the boys as well as the Society, as well as the inspectors of the Federal Government. We took exception to that. We thought it was not quite the right thing, and we appealed to the Department, that is, the Federal Department, to help us in the matter. Our contention was that migration children, as these boys are classed, did not come under that Act. We could not agree to the boys coming under the Provincial Act. We were curtailing expenditure, therefore, we came out of Brandon.

Q. You had trouble with the provincial government in Manitoba?—A. We had no trouble with the provincial government. We have an arrangement with the provincial government, which has been in existence for years.

Q. What was the cost of maintaining that building in Brandon?—A. It was closed last year. You see, we could not arbitrarily close a lodge down when we had between 500 and 600 boys in the province of Manitoba, and leave these youngsters without adequate after care. We had to keep it open, and while we did not introduce any new people, the lodge officers and the lodge itself was functioning for the boys we had brought in.

By Mr. Glenn:

Q. I am a little in doubt as to whether I got your evidence correctly. Let me get this clear in my own mind. Prior to the arrangement of the \$25, did you get from the government \$80 for the transportation of those brought into Canada?—A. Any child over 14 and under 17. I ought to explain that \$40 of that \$80 was found by the British Government.

Q. Your organization got \$80?—A. Yes.

Q. And in addition to that did you ask the boys to repay back to you a sum toward that transportation?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you get anything from the boy under that arrangement?—A. Not for transportation.

Q. For all purposes?—A. Yes.

Q. How much?—A. It would vary depending upon the boy's destination.

Q. Say for Manitoba—A. For Manitoba it would be £16.

Q. That would be \$160 for each boy?—A. Yes.

Q. Exception was taken to that, that is, to the repayment to you of \$80 from the government and \$80 for every boy brought into the country. What

do you get now?—A. We get \$100 for the transportation. When the \$80 was being paid it did not cover the cost of transportation. It has now been increased to \$100.

Q. Given by whom?—A. By the Federal and British Governments.

Q. Fifty-fifty?—A. Fifty-fifty.

Q. Then you asked also from each of the boys—I think you said £16 from Manitoba?—A. It is now \$25 all over the Dominion.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. That \$100 was only west of Ontario?—A. Yes. The grant is \$100 for Manitoba and the West.

By Mr. Glenn:

Q. And then in addition to that you got \$25 a head?—A. Yes. We have to collect it.

Q. I think you said you pooled all the money you received from the government but not the moneys you received from the boys, and I think you also told us there were no boys placed in Manitoba in 1925-26 and 1926-27?—A. Correct.

Q. So that you are applying that money for the transportation and the work you do for the boys in the other provinces?—A. No, if a boy did not go to Manitoba there was no \$80 given.

Q. You did not send any to Manitoba?—A. No; the grant was only paid if the boy sailed and went to the destination.

Q. Why did you send none to Manitoba?—A. There were two reasons. One was that we had opened a lodge exclusively for these boys at Brandon in the hope that the Federal Government would come to our assistance in the after care of these boys. They did not do so; therefore, it proved too large a drain on our funds and we had to curtail somewhat. We opened four lodges, one at Moncton in the maritime provinces, one at Smith's Falls, one at Woodstock, Ontario, and one at Brandon. In addition to the lack of funds the provincial Child Welfare Act was introduced which meant that the boys would have to be checked up three times and permission given by the provincial government to bring them into the country. We had to curtail somewhere, and we curtailed in Manitoba.

Q. I do not suppose you were satisfied with the amount you received, because no one ever is, but at all events you have accepted it as being a fair settlement made by the government as payment for the boys?—A. We were not contending so much for the amount when it came to the contention, but we were contending for the principle that a boy ought to repay something for his self-respect and to give him courage in the years to come. When the amount was fixed we had nothing whatever to do with it, and we accepted it because we were fighting for the principle.

Q. And so far as you are concerned now your organization is satisfied with the arrangement?—A. We have accepted the arrangement.

Q. Was that arrangement made after representations were made to you by the present Minister of Immigration, Hon. Mr. Forke?—A. I think the arrangement was arrived at strictly between Mr. Forke and the Overseas Settlement Department of the British Government, and we were notified by the Overseas Settlement Department of the British Government that they had come to this arrangement with the Canadian Government, and we accepted it.

Q. Were representations made at that time that with the signing of papers by the boy, they must bring in their parents or guardians also to sign?—A. Quite.

Q. And your settlement with the other Dominions of New Zealand and Australia follow along the same line?—A. No, sir. It was never raised in the other Dominions. They accepted the scheme as it originally stood.

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

Q. Is that practically the same scheme that is in existence?—A. As was in existence before the trouble arose in Canada. The new scheme of the parents signing is only in operation so far as Canada is concerned.

Q. Do you receive any money from New Zealand and Australia for these boys?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. On account of the long sea voyage and the difference in transportation?—A. No, sir, they help us with the training of the boys and with the after-care of the boys after their arrival in Australia.

Q. Is that done by the Federal Government or the States.—A. By the Federal Government and the States.

Q. There is co-operation between them?—A. Yes.

Q. You also have some co-operation from the province of Manitoba in regard to the care of the boys?—A. Not boys. I was answering Mr. Forke, who stated that we had had trouble with the Manitoba Government. I said we had had no trouble with the Manitoba Government, but were still acting and working in close co-operation with them. We have a grant from them now on account of the general women's work.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Do you get the same amount from Manitoba now?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. No grant for the boys?—A. We never had any.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. How much money from voluntary subscriptions or from your treasury do you have to pay on the average?—A. £10 per head.

Q. That is found from other sources than from the British Government, the Canadian Government and what the boys pay back?—A. After pooling all the resources we can get it costs our funds £10 per head.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. The total amount received by the Salvation Army from all sources, government grants, sums repaid by the boys, and so forth, does not as a matter of fact come anywhere near meeting the amount expended by the Army per head on the boy?—A. Absolutely not.

Q. Do you keep your accounts in this connection separate? Is there a line clearly drawn between the money received and spent for immigration and the money received and spent for other purposes?—A. Absolutely. The Salvation Army acts under two separate deed polls, one for the general organization, which is the religious side, and then there is the social side which is operated under what is known as "the Darkest England Trust." The accounts are entirely separate and published balance sheets are supplied each year. The central fund's balance sheet, which includes the religious side, is issued on the 30th of September, and the Darkest England, which embraces the immigration department and the other social activities, is issued as from the 31st of March each year.

Q. Are your records and accounts in connection with your immigration work open at any time to an inspection by a representative of the Dominion Government?—A. Wide open.

Q. Have you ever had representatives of the Dominion Government visit your head office and make such inspections?—A. So far as my recollection serves me we have not had a visit from an official of the Immigration Department at our head office for the last three or four years, except I understand that one of the women officers called at Montreal and asked for a few addresses of girls who are under after-care.

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

Q. The Immigration Department in a statement last year as shown in a Canadian Press despatch dated February 17th, says:

We cannot accept from the Army for official assistments persons of a standard below those to whom we would grant assistance if coming in under our own auspices.

That is a statement of the Immigration Department according to a Canadian Press despatch. Is there any foundation for such a suggestion that you bring or attempt to bring in persons of a lower standard than the Department itself secures?—A. I would unhesitatingly say, none whatever. As a matter of fact, from the information we can secure, I will venture the opinion that our failures are less than the average.

Q. Do you know of any cases where in your judgment or according to your knowledge or belief the Salvation Army has been discriminated against by the Government in immigration matters?—A. That is a very difficult question to answer. I would not want to say that the Government has discriminated against the Army, but I would say that some things are hard to understand.

Q. Let me give you a case in point, and perhaps you will recollect it. Is it true that the Immigration Department held up the sailing of a large number of women admittedly qualified for migration to Canada, giving as the reason therefor the alleged ground that in a case of one woman, Mary Dickson by name, the Salvation Army had wrongfully asked for certain repayments by her?—A. I remember that.

Q. Did they hold up the sailing?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Of a number of women?—A. Of a number of women who were ready to sail.

Q. About how many?—A. Speaking from memory, I would say twenty.

Q. And they based their reason for holding up the sailing on this case of Mary Dickson?—A. Yes. They said that until this case was thoroughly gone into and finalized, we could not send forward any more women under this scheme to Canada.

Q. The Government claimed that you had been asking improperly for repayments from Mary Dickson?—A. We did not ask for a penny.

Q. You say you did not ask for a penny?—A. No, sir, and I think we have satisfied the Government to that effect.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: What is the date of that document, Dr. Edwards.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Perhaps you can give us the year that occurred in?—A. That occurred in November, 1926.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. You might give us the circumstances; I did not catch that?—A. I am sorry I did not catch the question.

Q. The case of Mary Dickson, just why would the department capriciously stop the sailing of an expedition to this country because of one person?—A. We had a letter from the department in London to our head office there, saying that they had been informed from Ottawa that we had been collecting from one Mary Dickson a matter of \$100 on account of her passage; that as this girl had come out under the \$80 grant, therefore she should not be asked to repay any money. We asked at once for the papers, we went through our files and books, and assured the department that we did not and never had asked for any repayment on account of this girl.

Q. As a matter of fact, you satisfied the department?—A. As a matter of fact we could not understand the enquiry. We had at that time a number of

girls ready to come forward with a party, the last party of the year, in the latter part of November. The cases came before the department at London and were approved, but they would not give the necessary sanction for them to sail until this case was settled. We gave them an assurance. Commissioner Lamb handled the case personally.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. When you say that they would not allow them to sail until it was settled, just what do you mean? Was it on account of the general dispute as to the principle?—A. They did not take our word when we said that we were not asking the girl to repay anything, although we cabled to Colonel Tudge in Canada for full particulars; he supplied the department with them, but our word was not taken then. The day after the party sailed we got a letter from the director in London saying that they had found out the girl was not Mary Dickson at all but her sister Marion, whom we were collecting money from; as a matter of fact we were collecting money from Marion, an older girl, who came out under the Empire Settlement Act.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Did you finally satisfy the government that the charges were not well founded?—A. Absolutely.

Q. I presume you received due apologies from the Government?—A. We did not.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: That is a matter of detail the Minister will take care of in the near future.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I was not in the saddle at that time.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Regarding the assistance you received from the Australian Government, in answer to Mr. Glen's question, you said that you received \$80 per boy?

(The Committee took recess on account of a division in the House.)

(When the Committee resumed).

Mr. SPOTTON: Mr. Chairman, there is a feeling abroad, in England, we are told, that Canada does not want British immigration. Of course, I think that opinion is wrongly founded, but I would like to ask the witness if he would give us his opinion of the medical examination, and whether or not he thinks it could be simplified, or whether the present system works against the intending emigrant, whether he thinks there is too much red tape, and what he thinks about Canada sending over Canadian doctors. Canadian life insurance companies are satisfied to accept the word of British doctors, but the Immigration Department has not seen fit to do so, and I would like the witness to give us his opinion of the medical inspection from A to Z.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. May I be allowed to ask one question on what has already transpired before Mr. Spotton's question is put. My question is in connection with the grants that you receive from the different governments. Is it the case that your society or organization has received a grant of \$5,000 from the Dominion Government this year?—A. During the present fiscal year we understand there is a grant for general work. Mr. Forke promised \$5,000.

Q. You know that there is such a grant?—A. Yes, we understand there is.

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

Q. And that \$5,000 is over and above the amounts that are paid by the emigrant boys coming into Canada, and the amounts are paid to the boys and not to the society. It is paid to the boys.—A. We are promised this year a grant of \$5,000 for the general work of the department. It has nothing whatever to do with the passage grant.

Mr. DONNELLY: Do you now receive a grant of \$10 for the boys who are working on the farm?—A. For boys under seventeen years of age trained at Hadleigh, Essex. We have been promised it, but nothing has been paid as yet.

Q. But, in addition to their transportation, there has been a promise of a grant of \$10 from the Government?—A. For boys of seventeen years of age who are training.

Q. Who are training?—A. Yes, who are training.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. You say you have not received that yet?—A. We have received nothing on account of that yet.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Spotton's question, I think, has the right of way now.

WITNESS: With regard to medical examination, I feel that I can speak from first-hand knowledge of this, as I happen to be in charge of the London end of our department. Speaking personally, I should say that the idea underlying it is good, that is, giving the emigrant, if possible, the assurance that once he is passed in Great Britain, he will be able to land in Canada. It is rather early, however, to speak with any degree of certainty, as to what the outcome will be. It has only been in operation for a short while, but if it can be worked so that there will be no delays, then the idea is good. I am afraid, however, that there are delays occurring. Perhaps I could give you one or two illustrations which have come to my personal attention. I ought to say, however, before going on, that the medical examination also applies to passengers who pay their own fare as well as to assisted passages. It applies to all people coming to Canada to settle.

I had a woman in Gloucester, a single woman, wanting to go to Vancouver. She lived at a place that was fifteen miles away from the centre where the doctor was going to visit. The doctor was visiting that centre at 9.30 o'clock in the morning. The only bus or public vehicle that was available for that girl to get to the centre where the doctor was going to be, left at three o'clock in the afternoon; therefore, if she was going to be at the medical examination at the appointed time, namely, 9.30 o'clock in the morning, it meant she had to leave her home the day before, stay in Gloucester over night, and then was not able to get back to her home until late the next day. That girl, being a domestic servant, could not do it. As a matter of fact, we had to make special arrangements for her, in order to get her off quickly on a special party. She came to London at considerable expense and was examined there. That is just one difficulty.

Another case I had was that of a woman living in the Scilly Isles just off the coast of Cornwall. She was a fully paid passenger going out to Vancouver. The doctor was not scheduled to visit there at all. I wrote to the agent, and asked him what arrangements might be made for this woman to be examined, and I was instructed to bring her to Penzance to be examined by a roster doctor. The journey from the Island to Penzance is no joy trip, especially in February, in the Old Country. And the return fare would cost her one pound. There was just one boat a day, which meant she would have to stay over night. In addition to that, of course, she had to go and get her photograph taken before she could present herself to the medical doctor for examination.

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I always understood, a fully paid passenger could get examined at the port of embarkation?—A. I asked for instructions from the Government agent on the matter, and I was instructed to bring her to Penzance.

Q. That is the regulation anyway?—A. I am giving you actual facts, sir. I wrote to the agent and said to him, "Seeing this woman is to be examined by a roster doctor, could she not be examined by a roster doctor who lives in her own town?" to which I have had no reply. Meanwhile, the woman is in abeyance. She has given up the idea of going to Canada this year.

Q. What agent would that be?—A. The Bristol agent. I have not got particulars of his file here. It will be all on file. We had another family living in Canvey Island, which is a little island in the Thames. I wrote to the man and told him what to do, to present himself at the Town Hall with his family for examination on the Monday morning at eleven o'clock. Of course, he had to get a photograph of himself and family before he could be examined. The man found it was impossible before he could be examined. The man found it was impossible to get any photograph taken on the island, as there was not photographer there. When he went to Southend, he could not get the photographs quickly enough to present to the medical doctor. However, he presented himself with his family, but he was unfortunately told that he could not be examined without the photographs, and would have to come back in a month's time, or else go up to London for the medical examination.

Q. Of course, you cannot get into Great Britain without a photograph?—A. It is migration to Canada I am speaking of.

Q. When you go back to Great Britain, you have got to get a photograph?—A. I have to have one to come out.

Q. Not from Great Britain?—A. I have to have a passport before I could leave Canada in order to get back to Great Britain.

MR. FANSHER: Do I understand the Minister to say that a person coming to Canada does not have to have a photograph?

MR. EGAN (Deputy Minister of Immigration): From Great Britain they do not have to have a passport to come into Canada.

THE WITNESS: They have to have a photograph. But may I suggest in that connection that Great Britain is not asking for migrants. It is quite a different proposition going into Great Britain and going into Canada.

MR. SPOTTON: Do not be side-tracked. We are not discussing migration into Great Britain.

THE WITNESS: As far as we are concerned, as I have said before, we are quite in accordance with the idea that medical certificates ought to be taken up, but the new regulations are, in some instances, retarding the migration of the class you want to get, that is, the most desirable class. In the case of domestic servants, for instance, the girls only get perhaps one-half day a week. It means, if they are living in the country, they have to spend that half day going into a town to get their photograph taken, and then probably another half day has to be gotten off to go and see the doctor, at a different time, with double the expense.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Mr. Chairman, if the witness will permit, I would like to ask a question, that is, regarding the assistance you receive from the Governments of Australia and New Zealand. Did I understand you to say, in answer to a question put to you before, that you received from the Australian Government \$80 per boy, and \$80 from the British Government?—A. No.

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

Q. Well, what is the difference between the amount of assistance received from Australia, and that of Canada?—A. The Australian Government put up the entire passage money for the boy.

Q. The entire passage money?—A. Yes, for the boy up to the age of nineteen.

Q. Is the British assistance the same for those going to Australia, as for those going to Canada?—A. The British Government are prepared to go 50-50 with all schemes.

Q. With all countries?—A. Yes.

Q. But their 50-50 with Australia amounts to a great deal more than it does with Canada?—A. I should imagine so.

Q. And do they assist in the training of the boys as well?—A. Yes.

Q. Do they assist in the training of the boys for Canada?—A. The British Government?

Q. Yes?—A. Yes. The British Government assists in the training of all boys now who are sent overseas.

Q. Well, approximately, what is the difference in the assistance of the Australian boy scheme compared with that of Canada, for training purposes? Does the Australian Government assist you in training those boys?—A. The Australian Government assist in the training of some of the boys who are going to Australia, and also in connection with their aftercare. We get \$10 per boy under seventeen, for Canada, and nothing for aftercare.

Q. You do not get any assistance from the Canadian Government for training?—A. We are promised \$10 for training.

Q. As well as from the British Government?—A. Yes. We will receive \$10 for boys under seventeen. Our scheme is for boys from fourteen to eighteen. The Australian Government pay on all boys.

Q. With the assistance you receive from the British Government and the Government of Canada, and the Australian Government, what is the difference approximately, in total?

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. What does it cost to put a boy into Australia and into Canada?—A. I can only come back to my other statement and say it costs £10 a head over and above what we get from the various governments.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. What percentage of the cost for bringing the boys to Canada does your organization receive from the British Government and the Canadian Government and what percentage comes out of your organization funds?—A. 20 per cent comes out of our organization.

Q. About what percentage do you have to pay for those going to Australia?—A. I am sorry I cannot answer in that way, because we pool all the resources for all the boys we send overseas, and it costs the Salvation Army funds £10 over and above what we get from every one.

Q. The only difference then between Australia and Canada is that Australia pays you all the passage money?—A. The Australian Government finds all the passage money and part of the aftercare and training; the Canadian Government finds the passage money for boys under 17, pays us \$10 for their training, but no aftercare.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. You would not suggest doing away with the photographs altogether in connection with the evidence of identity before the medical examiners?—A. Would not signatures be as good as photographs?

Q. Do the photographs have to be taken by photographers, or are you allowed to use kodaks?—A. You are not allowed to use the kodaks; you must produce a photograph; snapshots are not accepted.

Q. You would prefer to have the signatures rather than the photographs?—A. To facilitate matters.

Q. It would be an easy matter to forge a signature, but not a photograph.—We are not dealing with the immigration of forgers.

Q. But the statement has been made that we are dealing in forged permits, why could we not deal with forged photographs?—A. I am not speaking of permits at all.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Would it facilitate matters if at the time of examination a snapshot or photograph was taken there and then by some assistant?—A. It would be of great service. I am not against the photograph; I am against the time and difficulty in securing proper photographs.

Q. Is it not a fact that only in the larger and more populous centres you can more readily obtain photographs?—A. Absolutely. That is what I say, that the people whom you want to get most are the people who are being retarded by these regulations.

The witness retired.

Discussion followed.

The Committee adjourned until 11 o'clock a.m. May 10th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, May 10, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: We will recall Staff-Captain Culshaw.

OWEN CULSHAW re-called.

The WITNESS: One of the questions I was asked yesterday was whether there was any idea in the Old Country that British immigrants were not required in Canada.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. Or were not wanted in Canada? There is a difference between wanted and required.—A. Wanted is the word, that is right. Rightly or wrongly there is that impression going abroad and such reputable newspapers as "The London Times" and "The Morning Post" have given expression to that thought. For example here is an extract from a leading article which appeared in "The Morning Post" as late as the 20th of April of this year. If I may be permitted to read it:

We gave an account yesterday of the difficulties which are set in the way of emigration to Canada, by the Canadian authorities. We have heard so many complaints of the system, that we incline to think the elaborate machinery of medical examination and so forth, covers some political design against the British emigrant. Certain it is that where there might be a great flow of British settlers into Canada, there is a mere trickle—a state of affairs by which Canada loses at the least as much as this country. If the Dominion were wise in its own interest, it would allow as free a movement between Great Britain and Canada as between London and Edinburgh or Quebec and Montreal. For consider the risks which Canada runs and the losses she suffers by the lack not merely of agricultural but of industrial population. The United States, with 115 millions or so of population, are exploiting her resources and pressing their claim upon her water, which she herself cannot use for lack of people. The Waterways question is in reality a water-power question; her Southern neighbours see clearly that those who control that great reserve of power control the industrial future of North America; and Canada is in danger of losing from sheer lack of men, to enter upon that rich inheritance.

That is the end of the leading article in "The Morning Post" of 20th April last.

Q. Do you think there is a possibility of our having as free communication between Britain and Canada as there is between Edinburgh and London or

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

Quebec and Montreal?—A. I read this as an expression of the opinion of "The Morning Post".

Q. But the question I am putting is, would you put any confidence or any weight or stress upon that article when it begins to talk in that way?—A. I will leave that to you. I have just read the article. I was asked the question whether the idea was prevalent in the Old Country. Having been asked that question, I am giving you the facts as they appeared in a newspaper. I do not wish to give any personal opinion on the matter at all. I have just given you what has appeared. Yesterday I gave you some particulars of the delays experienced. Now, in regard to the places chosen for examination. Complaints are being received from people who object to waiting in public rooms of buildings such as town hall et cetera, and by so doing advertising the fact that they are trying to emigrate, quite apart from the inconvenience caused. It is not unknown that people who have kept an appointment at the place agreed upon have found that the doctor has been delayed at his last appointment and therefore has failed to make the necessary connection for the next centre, and the people, thus disappointed, are delayed in most cases for a month. The securing of photographs presents difficulties to the people living in remote areas. Much inconvenience and expense is incurred by the taking of the necessary journey to the photographer, to say nothing of the loss of time. Is it not possible to establish a system whereby the signature of the applicant would be sufficient. After all the banks only require a signature for the drafts they issue in the Old Country which are payable in Canada and elsewhere.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Excuse me a minute. You spoke yesterday of the difficulty experienced by some one from the Scilly Isles. Do you know what the population of that area is?—A. I cannot tell you. It is available in the official books.

Q. Had you any idea when you make that statement what the population was?—A. No, I was dealing with the difficulty of a woman who was living there.

Q. Would you be surprised to hear that there are less than one hundred people?—A. I would be. My point yesterday as to the difficulty of the Scilly Isles was—

Q. The point was, that you stated the difficulty of a woman from the Scilly Isles being medically examined.—A. Yes, and the woman was ordered to come to Penzance to see a Roster Doctor when there was a Roster Doctor living in the same Island. Why should she be put to the trouble and expense of going to Penzance when there was a Roster Doctor living on the same Island.

Q. I thought the point was concerned with the number of people living there?—A. There was much more than that, Mr. Forke, I can assure you of that.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. On the point you mentioned of the photograph, is it not quite possible that a gentleman of the Health Department might take the photograph at the time the proposed emigrant appears for medical examination?—A. It would facilitate matters greatly. Unless the number of Canadian medical men is going to be considerably increased, which will of course mean greater expense, these difficulties and disappointments must continue. In view of the short season available to get people across to Canada, if they are to arrive at the right and proper time, valuable time cannot be afforded to be lost. I think that a return to the old system would be beneficial, but instead of the Roster Doctor being appointed by the emigrant, let the Canadian Government appoint and pay him as their referee, thus making him their servant and instruct him as to their special requirements.

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

Personally, I do not know nor have I heard of any doctor in the Old Country who desires to send undesirables to Canada or elsewhere. His personal reputation which is his greatest asset is at stake and he is not likely to treat the matter lightly. Under the old system it is true that an immigrant ran the risk of being rejected at the port of entry, but what are the figures of the rejects? Here they are, taken from the official returns. In the year 1919-20 there were 59,603 British arrivals, 21 rejected on medical grounds; in 1920-21 the arrivals were 74,202, 99 were rejected on medical grounds; 1921-22, 39,020 arrived, 60 were rejected on medical grounds; 1923-24, 72,919 arrived, 130 were rejected on medical grounds; 1924-25, 53,178 arrived, 83 were rejected on medical grounds; 1925-26, 37,569 arrived, 40 were rejected on medical grounds. After all, the rejects are not alarming and in the heaviest year they were less than one-sixth of one per cent. Even now the passenger is liable to be turned back at the port of embarkation by either the British Board of Trade doctor or the shipping company's medical man.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. I was going to interject there that as a medical man practicing in this country I have had several patients coming to me who are not healthy or strong and when inquiring from them I was told that they were passed by the British doctors who know they were not healthy, but who thought they would be all right in this country.—A. You have a remedy in instructing the medical men what you want. Up to now he has been the servant of the migrant, and I suggest that you make him the paid servant of the Canadian Government, and instruct him.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. You are not suggesting that because he was a paid servant of the migrant he was taking his instructions from them?—A. No.

Q. You infer that by saying that if we pay them they will take their instructions from us.—A. Naturally if you pay a man, he is your servant.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: As far as Canada is concerned her investigation should take place when the migrant comes to our shores. That is where we become responsible for the migrant. All the regulations and other movements which have been made with regard to examination on the other side have been done entirely for the protection of the migrant against going to the expense of selling out and coming over to this side. The roster doctors' examinations are never officially accepted. This was done as a sort of protection to the migrant that when he came to the other side and was thoroughly examined by the Canadian doctor, he would not be sent back. The Department has now undertaken to make that more rigid and make it less likely that the migrants shall be turned back. Canada as a nation in her own right does not need to send anyone over at all. Canada could set up her examinations on this side, but as we are anxious for immigrants and want to protect them we have established this system. The argument has gone along the line that Canada is bound to have examinations on the other side. There is nothing binding in that. The real examination is when the immigrant sets his foot on shore in Canada.

The WITNESS: Is there an idea in the Old Country that British immigrants are not wanted in Canada? This new system of medical examination is creating that idea. I am not giving this in a critical way; I am giving you the experiences coming to me.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: You mentioned yesterday that Australia has no situation like that. There is an article in my office taken from the *London Times* saying that Australia is having the same difficulty as Canada with regard to medical examinations, and I might add that there is a cable this morning that Australia

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

is so anxious to get immigrants that they have shut down on the examination in the meantime.

The WITNESS: Of course, it must be taken into consideration that this is the off season for Australia. While it is the opening of the season for Canada, it is the winter season for Australia and naturally they would close down for that season of the year.

May I pass on? In regard to the civil examination: it means that every applicant for assisted passage must be interviewed by a departmental officer. Let me say here that the departmental officers in the Old Country work hard in the endeavour to carry out and cover the ground as quickly as possible, but even then, on account of the short time at their disposal, they are handicapped and delays occur. It is not always possible for the applicant to get to the interviewing centre at a time convenient for the interviewing officer, and if he or she fails to attend twice—that is, being called on two occasions—the application goes by default and is lost.

Here is an example in the case of a girl who was asked to be at a point many miles from her home before 10 o'clock in the morning. This girl was living in the north of Scotland and this is the letter she received:

Dear MADAM: With reference to your application to proceed to Canada: please note that Mr. Murray will arrive at Peterhead on Friday, the 19th August, by the 9.52 a.m. train. It is absolutely necessary that you should be at the bookstall at Peterhead station for an interview. Please carry your handkerchief in your left hand. You cannot be accepted without interview and this is the last time interviews will be held in Peterhead for several weeks.

Yours faithfully,

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT AGENT.

The girl could not attend and has not arrived in Canada as yet.

There is another aspect to this matter. We had a number of applications for single men cancelled because the men themselves could not find the reduced rate of passage. The Board of Guardians, however, were willing to give them the money and for this, and for no other reason, they were unable to secure the assisted passage rates. I have the correspondence here which is very recent, the 20th of April.

I have your communication of the 19th inst. relative to the case of Robert Arnsworth, and as already explained to you, your quota under the Empire Settlement Scheme does not permit of the inclusion of those whose financial assistance is attended by the Board of Guardians. I therefore return your file.

I have a number of those, but this one will suffice. We have many people coming to the office and asking the question, "Does Canada want the immigrant?"

With regard to women for domestic service: here is another example which will speak for itself. We had received an application from a lady in Toronto who wanted a girl. We put forward an application to fill that nomination, and we received the following letter from the Glasgow agent of the department.

We are not prepared to recommend until such time as you can assure us that Mrs. Blank is willing to accept a girl who was a mill worker for three years, was at home for one year, then went into Preserve Works for seven years, and was laid off six months ago because of slackness of trade.

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

We made the following appeal to the Department:

Before asking for any further assurance from Mrs. Blank, I would be obliged if you would let me know whether, in the event of Mrs. Blank agreeing, you would be prepared to accept Miss Smith for the reduced passage rates.

The girl in question in our opinion is 'a good type': of good physique and character, and can do 'general housework,' 'plain cooking,' and 'washing'.

An examination of her application form and references will reveal that she has:

1. Managed a five-room and kitchen house;
2. Has had a family of five to look after;
3. Is a fair cook;
4. Holds medallion and certificate for First Aid—Home Nursing and Hygiene.
5. The Provost of Renfrew, who has known the applicant for 15 years, says, 'respectable, honest, trustworthy, and conscientious person.... held in high esteem.... has had considerable experience in housework including plain cooking.... have every confidence in her.'
6. A local J.P. says she 'comes of a good healthy family.... of excellent character.... good worker.... honest and trustworthy.'
7. Another reference states 'competent with children.... splendid needle worker.'
8. Her last employers after seven years' service say.... 'during her term of service performed her duties to our entire satisfaction.'

After reviewing the case, you may come to the conclusion that it is unnecessary to refer the matter back to Mrs. Blank, as when notifying us the nomination, you distinctly state that Mrs. Blank 'is willing to take a girl of good type, factory or otherwise,' and that you, or the Director, will be able to give the necessary authority for the girl to go forward on the descriptive nomination referred to. Should this be possible, as we hope it will, we would like her to sail on the "Laurentic" 28th instant, from Glasgow, with our Conducted Party.

Awaiting the favour of your reply,

I am,

Yours faithfully,

I am pleased to say that our appeal was upheld, and the Director gave the desired information. But the girl was delayed quite considerably while we were appealing on her behalf.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Has she arrived here yet?—A. As far as my information goes, she should have arrived on the Laurentic last week. I am not certain of that fact.

I have another case here. This deals with the medical examination. It is the case of another girl, in Scotland. This girl presented herself for medical examination, was passed as medically fit, her card was stamped and given back to her, but when she came forward for assisted passage she was refused an assisted passage because she weighed 150 pounds.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. You have said too much, or too little? There must have been more than that?—A. I do not know; I think you should judge.

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

Q. She was refused only because she weighed 150 pounds?—A. Yes.

Q. For nothing more than that?—A. Nothing more than that. If you will look at our London files you will find a letter in regard to this girl, saying that "she is of stupendous weight and we cannot recommend her for assisted passage." We have since appealed the case, and the Director has endorsed the card that she come forward as a fully paid passenger, but she cannot be given the reduced rate, and there is not other reason given to us than that she weighs 150 pounds.

Q. The departmental records will have to be examined?—A. I will give you the name of the girl. Her name is Flora L. McDonald; she comes from Glasgow.

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. Have you the correspondence in relation to this last case?—A. It is on its way here, but unfortunately I have not got it to-day. I sent it to the Glasgow agent, for her to try to find her own passage money, and it had not been returned to me in London at the time I left. It can be produced at a later date, when she arrives.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Meanwhile she is reducing?—A. We have not made any enquiry.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Do you think it is fair for you to make a plain statement that the girl was refused because she weighed 150 pounds?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I object to that; the Minister has no right to make any such statement. I submit he has no right to call in question the truth of the witness in that way.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I did not do that.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: You have no right to attack the witness in that way.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I am going to have my say. You keep your seat until I am through.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I will take orders from the Chairman, not from you.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Forke has the floor.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: I asked the witness if it was fair to state in his evidence that the girl was refused assisted passage because she weighs 150 pounds. I do not dispute your statement.

WITNESS: I am giving you the facts as we have them. If I had the correspondence I would put it in. The statement is that the girl was refused assisted passage rate because she weighed 150 pounds. That is the weight registered.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I ask for the floor for a moment. Speaking to the witness, Mr. Forke stated that this person was refused because she weighed 150 pounds? The witness says, "I am stating the facts, giving the facts," and the Minister says, "You are not giving the facts, these are not the facts." It was because of that statement on the part of the Minister that I rose to object. If the stenographer has taken down the remarks correctly, it will be shown that I am correct.

Mr. BROWN: I would suggest that it raises a great deal of doubt in the minds of the Committee, as to credibility; if he is willing to accept the evidence that the girl was refused because she weighed 150 pounds, and nothing else, I would suggest that that would be a little reflection upon the witness's evidence, as to the weight to give to the evidence.

Mr. MCGIBBON: The witness has said that that is all that there is against the girl. Surely that is to be accepted. I object, as I did a couple of weeks ago, to putting witnesses on the rack. It appears that any witness who gives evidence that the Government does not like is to be crucified before he goes.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: It was the same with Canon Burd.

Mr. CAHAN: I would suggest that the Department have an opportunity to enquire into any evidence they have in regard to this case.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Who turned this woman down?—A. She was turned down in the first place by the Glasgow agent. We appealed to London on it, and we were not turned down by London. The medical man had given permission for the woman to come to Canada, but because she is this stupendous weight—I think that is the actual word quoted—because of this stupendous weight she is not allowed to have the reduced passage rate.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Was she passed by a Canadian medical man?—A. She was passed by a Canadian doctor and given the official medical card.

Q. How old is she?—A. She is under thirty. I cannot say exactly.

Q. Have you seen the woman herself?—A. I have not seen her myself, but our Glasgow agent has seen her. I assume that the doctor, when he examined her, took her weight also.

By Mr. Fansher:

Q. Is there a letter which says she was refused passage because she weighed 150 pounds?—A. I cannot quote exactly but I will stand by my statement that that was the reason given why the girl was refused.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. You took the reason off the file?—A. Absolutely.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. You saw the file yourself?—A. I dealt with the file, and I dealt with the appeal to the Director in London.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Are those files available?—A. We got the Director to endorse the card, saying she could go as a full fare passenger. I wrote to the Glasgow agent to see if she could pay full fare, and unfortunately the file had not returned when I left London at the end of last week, but I wrote to him immediately before. I have my letter to Glasgow here:

As I am leaving for Canada to-morrow, there will be no time for you to send the papers back. Please send them to me at Montreal at once.

By the Chairman:

Q. Can you send that file in?—A. Yes. I will not take up any more of your time, except to thank you for the hearing you have given me, and to assure you that anything I may have said was only with the one idea, of helping in this great matter. It is the earnest desire of the Salvation Army migration officials to work in close co-operation and harmony with the responsible department, and we have no doubt that such can be and will be the case, as we have

[Staff-Capt. Owen Culshaw.]

no political axe to grind whatsoever. Perhaps it would not be out of place for me to quote an extract from the *The Times* report of the evidence given by Earl Grey before the Dominions Royal Commission.

Questioned as to the emigration of women, Earl Grey said there ought to be Receiving Homes in every large town in Canada. There was a great demand for women, and it was very desirable that machinery should be provided for them to go. The Salvation Army at the present moment was probably at the highest point of its disinterested service, and they ought to make use of the machinery at both ends. He had used it over and over again, and had never been disappointed.

Sir Rider Haggard called attention to the evidence given on a previous day by a witness who said that the Salvation Army was purely and simply a commercial undertaking.

Lord Grey: I do not think that any man who made a statement like that is aware of the work they do. The Salvation Army naturally has to obtain money in order to enable it to perfect its machinery, but that it is inspired by a self-sacrificing devotion to the public interest I have not the slightest doubt. The officers in charge of the organization are men of great capacity, and for several years, at any rate, you have got in the Salvation Army an organization which we ought to make use of. If we do not make use of it, we do not deserve to succeed.

Sir Rider Haggard: I am very glad to have that testimony from you.

Gentlemen, I thank you.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Approximately how long will it be before these documents you refer to are available?—A. They ought to be on the way now.

Q. Did you deal with them yourself?—A. I dealt with them myself.

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. The file will be deposited with the Committee?—A. The file will be forwarded to the Committee, if it is the wish of the Committee.

Q. I think it is the wish of the Committee that the file which is on its way to Montreal will be deposited with the Committee?—A. And be incorporated as evidence.

Mr. CAHAN: Reserving also to the Department the right to put in any evidence they may wish.

(Witness retired.)

Dr. DAVID A. CLARK called.

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I was sent over by my Department last November to inaugurate the medical examining services in Great Britain, and it was thought that some matters of interest to the Committee might be submitted by me in reply to questions. I scarcely know what line the Committee would wish me to take up, but I will try to answer any questions which any member of the Committee may submit.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are from the Health Department?—A. I am Assistant Deputy Minister of the Health Department. In hearing some of the evidence this morning, and after reading the evidence of other witnesses who had appeared

[Dr. David A. Clark.]

before the Committee, I noticed that some questions had arisen as to the reception which the medical examination was having in Great Britain. During the course of the inauguration of the service, I visited practically all of the central points at which our medical examinations were being held. Such as London, Derby, Glasgow, Southampton, Bristol, Belfast, Londonderry and some other points in Great Britain, Cardiff also. I took the opportunity on each occasion to speak to the emigrants who came forward for examination and asked them how they liked the new service. I did not find a single emigrant who had any objection to the service in any way. Of course, you will understand this was early in the service, but I will remember a reply made by a young man at Cardiff, a very excellent type of miner, who was emigrating, when I asked him. He said, "it is nice to think that when I get to Canada I will get into it if I pass the examination here." The same sentiment was expressed by a girl from Glasgow, coming out as a servant girl. I interviewed also many who were being examined in the London office and at Southampton and at other points at which I had spoken. I did not then meet a single emigrant who was not quite enthusiastic about the merits of the whole scheme.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. What month was that in?—A. That would be in January and February of this year. On the Continent, of course, conditions were quite different, and many of the emigrants there—I was not able to speak their language, but I did not see any evidence of any irritation on the part of the emigrant on account of the existing conditions. I also spoke to many officials of the Government of Great Britain and of Northern Ireland and we naturally discussed the whole plan. Mr. Clark, of the Ministry of Labour, who has charge under Mr. Steel-Maitland, the hon. Minister of that Department, the Labour end of Immigration, for Great Britain, expressed himself in the most enthusiastic terms on the plan and he said he knew of nothing since he had been connected with the Department of Labour which he felt would simplify his work so much as the plan of final examination of those contemplating going to Canada, in England.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Dr. Clark, may I ask you this: while you were in England, you, of course, read the newspapers dealing with matters relating to your Department. Did you or did you not see echoes and re-echoes throughout the English press of a degree of irritation over the methods adopted for carrying out these examinations?—A. Lots of it.

Q. And did you personally investigate as to whether they were well founded or not?—A. Yes. Before I left England I was invited by the Hon. the High Commissioner to meet Sir Holford Kindersley, the Chairman of the Shipping Board. I met him in the office of the High Commissioner and we discussed the article which had appeared in *The Times* and *The Morning Post*, which I think was read this morning, and various other papers in Great Britain. Sir Holford, after reading the articles, said: "it is quite manifest to me that all these articles are excerpts from some prepared memorandum which has been sent to these various papers."

Q. Propaganda?—A. Well, I hesitate to use the word propaganda, but I did hear it used by other persons. He said that it was quite evident to him that these editorials were excerpts from some document, from which these papers had taken out what the editor wished, and it was quite evident that this was the case, because the same sentences occurred in different papers, but in no paper was the article quite complete.

Q. Did not these complaints involve complaints first with regard to the publicity which families had to undergo to secure examination, and secondly,

were there not a large body of complaints with regard to families being compelled to go to public houses and even in some cases to insane asylums and other places of like nature for examination?—A. The expression used in most of the cases was, that it was “feared” that this would very materially retard British emigration, because in some instances of the distances they had to go and because in some instances they would be compelled to go to public houses. In the first itinerary of our medical men in Great Britain, which was compiled, of course, in a very great hurry, there were forty-six public houses in Great Britain which were designated as places of examination. These places were all recommended either by the town or the railway interested; by the representative of the Labour Department, or a representative of the Health Department of Great Britain, in or near the place concerned.

By Mr. Brown:

Q. What is the definition of a “public house”, as the term is used in Great Britain?—A. Of course, it is quite different from here.

Q. Is it a hotel?—A. Yes, it is a hotel, of course. There were forty-six of those in our first itinerary; they have now been reduced to four. There are only four places in the whole of Great Britain and Ireland in which examinations are conducted in hotels.

Q. It is not simply a saloon?—A. Oh, no, it is the best hotel in the place, recommended, as I say, by either the four bodies, the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Health, the municipality itself, or the Royal Automobile Association.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Will you tell the difference between an ordinary public house and a hotel?—A. I think many of the members of the Committee know that.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. There are a good many of the Committee who do not know the difference between a public house and a hotel. Those of us who have come from there know what a public house was in real life.—A. Well, a public house, of course, is simply a drinking place, in Great Britain.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Were any of these intending emigrants received in these public houses?—A. No, none of them received in drinking places.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Have you seen in the public press a complaint made by an emigrant to British Columbia, a man of wealth and position who wished to go there with his family and who refused to attend the examination because he thought the place where the examination was to be held was not a fit place to take his daughter?—A. No, I did not.

Q. There was a case of that kind. It was said to have been reported to the Canadian Immigration Department as well.—A. I did not see it.

Q. Did you find any public house or place where you as a man of family would be ashamed to take your daughters?—A. No, I did not. In the Labour Bureaus there was usually a large room, always I may say, a large room and a private room which was the office of the man in charge of the particular bureau. That office was used by our physician as the examining room. The larger room was used as the waiting room. In some instances there were two rooms.

Q. Did the examination involve the stripping of girls and women for examination?—A. May I read a letter. "This was the complaint of a woman sent to our department in the matter of stripping; and further it was said that she was a returned Canadian and that she had been subjected to an examination. She was presented for our examination at the Canadian Office in the usual manner as a full paying passenger and, of course, we would have no idea as to who instructed her to present herself for examination; nor unless she went out of her way to tell the doctor, would we have any idea that she had been in Canada before. Dr. Parkes told me that she had never stripped any applicant for emigration to Canada since she arrived on this side." I do not know of a single doctor who has, and we discussed that point very fully and I am quite satisfied that no doctor in our service has stripped or nearly stripped any patient in any examination. Of course, our doctors are there to find out if a person is physically fit to come to Canada, and you cannot make a physical examination through an overcoat or the ordinary clothing; but I am satisfied, as I said before, that not a single person has been unduly exposed in any examination by any of our doctors, whether they were men or women.

Q. You will understand I am not making any reflections.—A. Quite so, but I want to explain it.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I might say, Doctor, that I met that woman in Ottawa here and she made the same statement to me, and in the presence of a member of Parliament. Now, I said, you are just exactly the woman I have been waiting to find; I want to get a definite statement that these things actually took place that you say, and if I jot down a few lines will you sign it. "Oh, Mr. Forke," she said, "the lady who examined me was so kind and nice to me and treated me so well that I do not want to give you an official complaint." I said, "you will be doing a public service if you will stand behind the statements you have made," but she retracted. The Member who was standing with me said, "that woman ought to be prosecuted".

Mr. BROWN: In view of the publicity given to the fact that they have been so examined, it might be resented by some of the people who have had to present themselves.

The WITNESS: They have to appear for examination, if that is what is meant by publicity.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Is the publicity of the place of examination, and the date, and the congregation of people there at the time of the examination, tending to preclude sensitive people from coming to be examined?—A. I wouldn't think so. They can slip into the place of examination just as easily as they can into a doctor's office.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. Either they have to be examined or not. If they have to be examined to find whether they are physically fit, there must be some measure of stripping, to examine, for instance, for varicose veins?—A. Yes, as I said before, the doctor cannot examine through heavy clothing.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Are they examined for venereal disease too?—A. Not as completely as some might wish. Venereal disease, of course, is impossible to detect in a chronic form without most minute examination, microscopic, for instance, and if

[Dr. David A. Clark.]

a doctor happened to suspect venereal disease from the condition of underclothing or anything else he would make a more minute examination; but venereal disease in its chronic form is undetectable except by minute microscopic examination.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. What would be done in the case of consumption?—A. Oh, yes, they would expose the chest, of course.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. A short time ago, you were speaking of reports that were appearing in the paper that you were rather reluctant to call propaganda. Did any one give you any information as to the possible source of that propaganda? I would call it propaganda, whether it is right or not?—A. Well, gentlemen, taking my cue from the last witness, I shall stick absolutely to facts. I hear lots of stories about propaganda, but, of course, I traced none of them to an absolute source.

Mr. Rawlinson, the agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Antwerp, attended at the offices of the medical adviser in Europe, in London, and stated that the number of those held back at Antwerp was destroying the business of the company there.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Those are Continental emigrants, emigrants from the Continent?—A. Yes. Our medical examiner immediately wrote this letter to the general manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Charing Cross. This is the second letter he wrote. He got no reply to the first one. (Reading):

DEAR SIR,—With further reference to my letter of the 5th instant, I would appreciate very much if you could let me have the particulars of the cases held up in Antwerp for so great a time as to seriously injure your business through that port.

I would again beg to state that I am astounded that you are able to make a statement of this nature, for less than a week previously I had personally re-examined all cases submitted by the steamship companies in Antwerp and, on looking through the records in this office, I can only find two cases held up for further report, further examination or for further treatment.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. How many immigrants are examined a month?—A. Doctor Audette at Antwerp examined this year, up to the 31st of March, 4,054 people at Antwerp.

Q. That is about 1,300 a month?—A. January, February and March.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. How many were rejected?—A. I have not got those figures, Mr. Cahan. That takes time to get from across the sea.

Q. Well, doctor, I do not want to take you off your line of thought, but I would like to know if you have had similar complaints with regard to medical examinations in Great Britain as being a deterring factor.

Mr. McGIBBON: Mr. Cahan, if you do not mind I would just like to complete that. That would probably be 40 or 50 cases a day. How many doctors are employed?

WITNESS: We had one doctor there.

Q. Do you think one doctor can do that?—A. Well, during that time he did by working almost day and night. He worked up till twelve o'clock many nights.

[Dr. David A. Clark.]

Q. Well, supposing he did?—A. He did the best he could, and he is one of the very best doctors we have over there.

Q. I am not disputing that. It is a physical impossibility though, I would say?—A. It was not quite a physical impossibility, but I admit that it was very hard work for him. We would have put more there if we had had them.

Q. Is not that one of the complaints, that under this system you have not had the doctors to give the services?—A. No, I do not think so. I think we are covering the ground.

Q. Yes, but he only covers it by often travelling around through the different centres?—A. Yes.

Q. Consequently, they only get to some of the places occasionally?—A. They get to the important places every week, and to the less important places every two weeks.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. You have several doctors on the Continent?—A. Yes.

Q. How many?—A. Seven.

Q. Where are they—A. Dr. Duplessis in Paris; Dr. Audette at Antwerp, Dr. Ferguson and one other at Danzig, Dr. Roland at Riga, Dr. Savoy at Hamburg, and another doctor at Rotterdam whose name I have not yet, because he has been sent there since Dr. Ferguson who was at Rotterdam was sent to Danzig on account of the great number of examinations there.

Q. How many Canadian doctors have you in Great Britain?—A. We now have 21.

Q. Is it not a fact that there are more immigrants coming from the Continent than from Great Britain?—A. Yes, that is a fact. On the Continent we examine the immigrant at the port of departure, and the doctor does not have to leave his office in the city concerned.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Can he speak the language?—A. They learn pretty well to ask the questions in the little time that is necessary for a medical examination.

Q. But they do not know the different languages of the people coming from the continent?—A. Not to carry on a conversation, but they know enough to ask most medical questions.

By the Chairman:

Q. Doctor, how many immigrants did Dr. Duplessis examine in Paris?—A. Dr. Duplessis examined up to the 31st of March, 3,345.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. Doctor, in your tour of the British Isles, did you spend any time in Liverpool on inspection work?—A. Not very long in Liverpool. I spent a day in Liverpool.

Q. In regard to the examination of female applicants coming to Canada, immigrants, I have a couple of communications which cast some doubt in my mind in connection with the matter. One is very specific, and the other is equally specific, although probably not in as strong language, going to show that these females were subjected to very humiliating experiences by strange doctors, and I would just like to have it further explained by you, if you can. In this one particular case of which I speak, I have known this young man for 22 years, and I do not think you could find a more honest or more honourable citizen, probably not in as high a position as some in this country, but he is certainly held in very high esteem in his community, and I do not doubt his word in the least. I have a letter from him to this effect, and I would like some explanation of that. These

things are communicated to me?—A. Well, we will be very glad, I am sure, in our department, to have any definite complaint in reference to any one who has been improperly dealt with by our physicians. We have at Liverpool three very, very fine physicians, very, very courteous gentlemen, and I would be very much astonished if they subjected any one to any indignities, or to any examination which was not absolutely necessary to determine their physical or mental fitness. We would be very much indebted in the department if we could have particulars in reference to any case. We have had a number of cases submitted to us. We have traced them up, and I have not in mind at the moment a single case in which it was necessary to reprimand our doctors for improper or too vigorous an examination.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Doctor, have you at the point of examination any nurses, or lady assistants to assist them?—A. At certain points, yes. At Glasgow, for instance, which is a very large centre for woman's immigration, the woman's immigration officer assists. At several other points, we have a lady stenographer, practically at nearly all points, who will assist, and our endeavour is, of course, to perfect the system more and more. You must understand, gentlemen, that this system only went into operation on the 14th of February, and, without boasting, we think we have done particularly well in the short and hurried period in which it has been forced upon us. Next year we will have four months that we did not have this year to get ready for the spring influx, and if there are any improvements to be made, it certainly is the desire of the department to make them.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Did you find any enthusiasm among the British doctors, with regard to the introduction of this scheme of examination?—A. Well, Dr. Cox, who I think is the Secretary of the Medical Association of Great Britain, made no complaint about the scheme when it was submitted to him. In fact, he approved of it, and thought it was the proper procedure. Certain roster doctors have complained, possibly because they lost the \$2.50 for each immigrant they examined, or possibly because immigrants have made protests to them as to their disinclination to go to Canadian doctors.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. There are a number of possibilities?—A. Quite.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Do you think it is the roster doctors who are starting this propaganda in Great Britain?—A. No, I do not think so.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. Did you make any effort to trace the origin of these excerpts which you saw in the press?—A. Well, I was too busy getting the service going to do very much of that. I personally could do very little, because as I say, I was too busy all the time. I went as far north as Riga in old Russia, and I stopped at Danzig, Bremen and Antwerp, and altogether I did not have very much time.

By Mr. McKenzie:

Q. You have not heard any criticism lately?—A. Well, I would not say that.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like the stenographer, if he will, in the meantime, to write out the question which I asked the doctor, so that when

[Dr. David A. Clark.]

he appears again, he will be familiar with it, because I would like to press that question. If he had a copy of it, he would understand the nature of the inquiry we are making.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Doctor, the last witness Mr. Culshaw made the statement, and gave some figures, stating, if I remember rightly, that only one-sixth of one per cent of the immigrants coming to Canada in the last four or five, or six years possibly had been rejected at the port of entry. Do you hope, under your present medical examination, or present system, to reduce that percentage?—A. I thank you for the question, sir. At the port of entry into Canada, only an inspection of the individual was made. It was not a medical examination at all. As you know, they came off the ship, walked up a ramp, and the doctor looked at them with their clothes on. He looked at their fingers, and he looked at their hair, and so on, so you could not expect our doctors at the ports of entry in Canada to detect a very large percentage of those entering. But, gentlemen, please remember this: last year there were deported from Canada nearly 600 people who had improperly got into Canada, and we hope with this examination, to prevent that tremendous deportation.

In the month of February, our doctors examined in Great Britain about 6,000 prospective immigrants. The certified 640 of those as having certain physical or mental defects that would prevent them making a living in Canada, or at least would militate seriously against them making a living in Canada. In other words, they certified nearly 10 per cent of those offering themselves for immigration to Canada.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. What nationalities were those that were deported? You said 600. Have you any information on that?—A. I can get it. I would not like to give it to you off-hand.

The CHAIRMAN: Being one o'clock the Committee will adjourn until 4 o'clock.

The Committee adjourned until 4 p.m.

The Committee resumed at four o'clock.

Dr. DAVID A. CLARK resumed.

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, this morning Mr. Cahan asked a question. I think this was the question, or the import of it at least:—

Dr. Clark, may I ask you this; while you were in England you of course read newspapers dealing with matters relating to your Department. Did you or did you not see echoes and re-echoes throughout the English press of a degree of irritation over the methods adopted for carrying out these examinations?

Was that your question?

Mr. CAHAN: I think that was one of the questions. I want your general view as to all this mass of rumour from across the ocean.

WITNESS: I answered that this morning by referring to an interview with the Hon. the High Commissioner, and Sir Holford Kindersley. In order to sense, as it were, the opinion of the great part of the English people in relation to these articles which were appearing in the big newspapers, and to see how far they were

[Dr. David A. Clark.]

penetrating into the minds of other newspapers in Great Britain, during the two Sundays following the appearance of this article in *The Times* and other papers, I arranged with a newsdealer in London to supply me with a copy of every Sunday newspaper published in Great Britain, as I thought they would fairly represent the sentiment of Great Britain. I searched through, in company with Dr. Jeffs, every one, every single one of those Sunday newspapers, and in not one of them did I find the slightest reference to the article in *The Times* or the other newspapers, and I thought possibly, as someone had expressed it, that there was more propaganda than endeavour to get at the truth in the whole of the agitation. I may have been wrong in that, but that was the result of the efforts I made to get at the bottom of things.

My attention was directed a day or two ago to an article appearing in one of the newspapers, and I suppose it was a fair excerpt from the gentleman's evidence:

Colonel Dennis declares that instances have actually arisen in connection with the colonists recruited by his Department in Great Britain who have come forward to the port of embarkation, holding physical and mental certificates of fitness from the Canadian Corps of Doctors, but who have been rejected and refused permission to embark by the Board of Trade Doctors.

The inference drawn farther down in the article was that the Canadian Doctors were inefficient in their examination, and that the Board of Trade Doctors were picking out undesirable immigrants which the Canadian Doctors had not been able to pick out.

Mr. CAHAN: I understood from the evidence I heard that it was simply a suggestion that in some cases the Board of Trade officers were rather more severe in their examination.

The WITNESS: That is exactly what I want to point out to the Committee, that the Board of Trade doctors have no connection whatever with the examinations; the Board of Trade doctors are only concerned with infectious diseases, and as our doctors make examinations for physical and mental competence to carry on in Canada they have no relation whatever to infectious disease which the man may develop. Our examination may be made four months before the man presents himself at the port of embarkation. A man may very well come on with a case of skin disease which he has acquired in the meantime, or a case of smallpox which he may have acquired in the meantime. Of course he will be stopped at the port by the sanitary authorities for which the Board of Trade are responsible. That has nothing to do with the medical aspect of emigration whatever.

Mr. CAHAN: That is a very helpful explanation.

The WITNESS: A question was raised this morning by the gentleman from the Salvation Army, in which he said that the matter of the emigrant having to go to a professional photographer to get a photograph to place on his card was a hardship. Now, the Department of Health does not exact any professional photograph whatever; any photograph of any size, taken by an amateur, provided it is recognizable as a photograph of the individual carrying the card, is accepted by our medical officers.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I made the statement that a snapshot would do, but it was denied?—

A. We have accepted lots of them.

[Dr. David A. Clark.]

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Could you not make arrangements, as suggested, that at the time of the medical examination someone should take an ordinary snapshot, or something which would identify the individual at the time?—A. You see, they have plenty of time, between the time they go to the transportation company to discuss coming to Canada and their appearance before the medical man, to get some kind of a photograph on the card. A card is given to them at the time they first appear at the transportation company's office to intimate that they want to go to Canada. The transportation man hands them a card and says: "You had better see if you are medically fit to go." It is all in the instructions of the North Atlantic Passenger Conference to the agent of the transportation companies, instructing them what to tell everybody who comes forward wanting to go to Canada.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Is there any reference to a photograph, in those instructions?—A. Oh, yes.

Emigrants may present themselves for examination at any of the medical centres arranged, particulars of which are contained in the following pages of this booklet. No previous notice of intention to present themselves for examination need be given, but emigrants must be provided with card of identity bearing photograph of passenger.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Bearing what?—A. The photograph of the passenger.

It is important that this photograph should be pasted or gummed in the space provided on the card, and should be a good recognizable photograph of the emigrant.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. If I remember his evidence correctly, he said it would have to be done by a photographer?—A. Exactly. That is what I was trying to explain. But that is not the fact at all.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. I am, perhaps, confusing what I heard outside with what I have heard before this Committee, but my impression was that in these country places an applicant would have to go for perhaps a day's trip to some town or to some more or less distant centre to get a photograph of any size, and it meant a day's absence from work. Could not that be obviated in some way by your Department taking a photograph at the time the applicant appears?—A. If these complaints exist, the Department is perfectly willing to do everything it can, but I never heard any complaints myself while I was there. Our Medical Officer in Europe has never advised us that any such complaints reached him.

Q. But from the newspapers. You will take that into consideration?—A. I will be glad to. I do not know whether the members of the Committee have a sample of the card or not, but I have here the card which is given to everybody who comes to enquire about going to Canada.

Q. Supposing an applicant comes in from a country district five or ten miles away, he hears that one of your medical officers, is at a certain town on a certain day; that might be the first opportunity he would have of seeing him?—A. Generally, yes, making enquiries. We would simply say "Go to any transportation company, get a card, and come here."

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. There is a place in pretty nearly every town?—A. Yes, I think so. Now, it has been said that the medical inspection overseas is holding up immigration. We have no methods of comparison between this year and last year of the general immigration because last year or up until this year there was no medical inspection abroad, it was simply an inspection at the port of arrival, as here. But in assisted passages of all kinds, for some years it has been necessary for the applicant to have a certificate of mental and physical fitness before his assisted passage would be considered. Up until the 28th of April last year there were 4,916 persons examined in Great Britain by Roster Doctors for assisted passages. Up till the 28th of April this year our doctors had examined for assisted passages 4,915.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. One less?—A. One less. So that, so far as the medical services are concerned, I think the contention is fair that that branch of the service at least is not holding up immigration.

I was asked before I came on the stand to-day to make some reference to the foreign born, or rather born-out-of-Canada that were in the public institutions of Canada.

Q. Have you any recollection of the case of the girl who was refused admission because she weighed 150 pounds?—A. No. This morning was the first time I heard of that incident. I was wondering whether the girl weighed 150 stone.

Q. You know almost all the medical men of your overseas department, I suppose?—A. I know them all.

Q. Are all those men qualified graduates of universities?—A. Absolutely. Some of them are gold medalists. They state their qualifications in their application to the Civil Service Commission.

Q. Of Canada?—A. Of Canada. All of them are licensed practitioners of some province in Canada, and in the selection by the Civil Service Commission, the absolute preponderating rule of selection was the excellence of the qualifications submitted.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. What salaries are those men drawing?—A. \$3,000 plus \$600 for living abroad.

Q. Is that a salary at which you can secure good medical men for this service?—A. The answer to that, I think, sir, is that we did procure excellent medical men.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. They would be mostly young men?—A. Quite young. They were not absolutely immediate graduates, they were mostly men who had graduated two, three or four years before, and all of them had hospital experience of some kind or had had training. (This question of the inmates in Canadian institutions, of those born outside of Canada.)

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. That is, institutions for the insane or feeble-minded?—A. Yes, exactly. It opens up the whole question as to why this service was established.

The province of British Columbia appointed a Royal Commission some years ago to investigate the numbers of those born outside of Canada in the public institutions of British Columbia, and an analysis of the records of admission to British Columbia mental hospitals during ten years, from July 1, 1916, to June 30, 1926, made specially for this Commission, shows a total

of 3,485 individuals admitted as insane, and 353 admitted as feeble-minded. Of the 3,485 insane only 27.8 per cent were Canadian born. In other words, the Canadian born 50 per cent of our population furnished only 28 per cent of the insane admitted to our institutions, while the foreign born immigrants, 50 per cent, furnished 72 per cent.

Q. Now, that word "foreign" includes British?—A. Exactly.

Q. Great Britain and Northern Ireland?—A. Yes. It is not a good word, but that is the word used.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. It means all immigrants?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. It would not mean immigrants from outside Britain?—A. Well, there is a further tabulation that I would like to submit to the Committee, as follows: British Isles, 29.31 per cent of the population furnished 39.52 per cent of the insane.

Europeans 6.04 of the population, furnished 17.22 per cent of the insane.

U.S., 6.66 per cent of the population furnished 8.18 per cent of the insane.

Asiatics, 6.20 per cent of the population furnished 4.47 of the insane.

By Mr. Cahlan:

Q. Can you give us those in numbers that represent those percentages, the number from Great Britain, for instance?—A. No. It may be later on in the report somewhere, but I am only reading this from the report.

Q. When you use the word "population" do you mean the number of immigrants that come in?—A. No. When I say "Europeans" 6.04 per cent of the population, that means there is 6.04 per cent of the population of British Columbia Europeans; and when I say "Asiatics" 6.20 per cent of the population of British Columbia are Asiatics, and they furnish 4.47 per cent of the insane.

The British possessions 1.31 of the population—being, of course, 1.31 per cent of the population of British Columbia—furnished 2.47 of the insane. That was the report from British Columbia. We made inquiries, because we were a long time discussing the establishment of this service. The Deputy Minister and the Chief of the Immigration Service made inquiries as far as they could in all the provinces of Canada, of what was happening in the matter of the foreign-born, if you will allow me to use the term as it is an easy one, in Canada.

Mr. H. M. Robbins, Deputy Provincial Secretary of Ontario, under date of August 26, 1927, wrote the Department as under. (Reading):

The total number of foreign-born persons so far reported as public charges in the province during the years 1924-25-26 is 3,170. Of this list, 519 are in the Ontario Reformatory; 157 in the Mercer Reformatory; 202 of the foreign-born are insane; 1,118 of them are in public institutions in Toronto and the balance are scattered all over the province. The serious side of the question is that, with very few exceptions, every one of these 3,000 persons is a public liability and a demoralizing element in the community, and supplies the strongest reason why there should be some change made in an immigration policy which imposes such a heavy burden upon the taxpayers of the province of Ontario.

Q. That 3,000 odd that you are speaking of, that would be 3,000 out of what number coming into that province, have you any idea?—A. 3,000 foreign-born in the province were in the institutions.

Doctors Laidlaw, Alberta, and Seymour, Saskatchewan, wrote as follows. (Reading):

Dr. LAIDLAW: We have at the present time in our mental hospitals in the province of Alberta 1,076 out of a population of 588,000. Of these, roughly speaking, 70 per cent were foreign-born. Of this 70 per cent, 29 per cent came from Europe and 40 per cent from Great Britain, Ireland and the United States. The cost of maintaining these people in our province was about \$250,000.00, or about \$235.00 each for the year.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Do they say that these are recent immigrants?—A. No, he does not intimate when they arrived.

Q. Is there not a certain number of these immigrants deported?—A. Well, to deport an immigrant—I stand subject to correction by the Deputy Minister of Immigration—he must have had the disability at the time he arrived in Canada. If a man becomes insane after he arrives in Canada, it is pretty difficult for even an alienist to say that he was a potentially insane man when he arrived in Canada.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Is there any provision for deporting the other members of his family, his children, who are born in this country?—A. That is an immigration question. I think, in many instances, the family is deported along with the individual.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: If they are willing to go.

WITNESS: Yes, if they are willing to go.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Yes, but they might not be willing. I will withdraw the question. It is a leading one.

WITNESS: Doctor Seymour, Deputy Minister of Health of the Province of Saskatchewan writes: (Reading)

Dr. Seymour: I wish to endorse the remarks made by Dr. Laidlaw because conditions in my province are very similar, with the exception that I believe the proportion of foreign born in our mental institutions in Saskatchewan is a little larger.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Are those gentlemen all using that term "foreign born" in the same sense?—A. Yes, I think so. It is evident from the further context that they are using it in that sense.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Doctor, can you tell us what proportion of the population of Saskatchewan at the time were foreign born within the meaning of the word?—A. No, I cannot. These are only reports that were received from doctors on the question, men who understood it.

I think at the last meeting of the Interprovincial Conference held last December in Ottawa, Premier Taschereau made the remark that there were fully 600 foreign born inmates of the asylums of the province of Quebec.

[Dr. David A. Clark.]

Those, gentlemen, were the reasons which induced the Deputy Minister of the Department of Health to strongly recommend to the Hon. the Minister that this plan of establishing medical examination overseas be adopted, in order that this flow of those who later become public charges in institutions of the provinces might be checked as much as possible.

Q. Could I ask another question here, doctor?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you not think that the medical examination in Great Britain would be carried on so as to create less irritation if the actual examination were made by British medical doctors with a general supervision by your Department?—A. There were 590 deportations last year from Canada for physical causes. Of these, about 70, or 11.86 per cent, were ex-Imperial soldiers, and 50, or 8.47 per cent, came forward on assisted passages. In other words, the roster doctors were missing a tremendous lot of those that were being submitted to them for examination, and it was felt that they were not living up to the requirements which Canada demanded, and that is what influenced very strongly the Deputy Minister in representing to the Hon. the Minister that Canadian doctors who understood Canadian conditions should be sent over to make those examinations.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Had the roster doctors explicit instructions from the Canadian Government as to what was required of them?—A. They were given as explicit instructions as our medical adviser overseas could compile. But you can readily understand, they did not understand Canadian conditions. Many of them thought—and I am speaking from general observation gathered from their reports—that a case of consumption in its early stages would be splendidly benefited by sending them out to Canada, and similarly in other conditions. It was not altogether the fault of the roster doctors. They did not understand Canadian conditions. Very few of them had ever been here. And, another point, the immigrant which the roster doctor examined, was, in many instances, his own patient, and there were many evidences of the examination being shaved when we came to look them over here. The examinations had actually been shaved by the doctor in favour of his own friend.

By Mr. Caham:

Q. Would not that be obviated, to a certain extent, if the roster doctor were an actual employee of your department, and paid by you instead of being paid by the applicant?—A. Still, he would help his friend a good deal, in many instances.

Q. Doctors do not on insurance, usually. The last one I appeared before for insurance did not.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Doctor, we have had one case here, the McConachie case. Do you know particulars of that from the Department's point of view?—A. Yes. I think I know it pretty well. I was one of those who saw the baby in England after it was deported. This baby was examined by a roster doctor. The report was submitted to London, and, of course, there was no hint on the report that there was anything the matter with the baby. It came over to Canada with the mother. I am going to try and state the facts as accurately as I remember them; although I was not in Canada at the time it arrived. The ship's doctor, seeing the baby, and fearing the fine of \$200 which is inflicted on every transportation company that brings a feeble-minded person into Canada, reported the a pitiable thing to see, and there was the picture that all of us had seen before, as to its mentality.

[Dr. David A. Clark.]

Q. To whom did he report?—A. He placed it on his bill of health, which they are required to make out, and when it arrived at the port of Halifax, it was examined by our doctors there. They came to the conclusion—

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. How do you know that, is that your personal knowledge?—A. No, it is not my personal knowledge. I am just trying to recite the facts.

Q. Will you confine it to your personal knowledge?—A. If you wish. I understood the gentleman to ask for a full report. On a certain day, Mrs. McConachie brought the baby to the offices of the medical examining services in Canada Building, London. Myself, Dr. Jeffs the Chief Medical Officer in London, Dr. Parmey, the Assistant Medical Officer there examined the baby. We had an excellent opportunity of looking over it, and we all arrived at the conclusion that there was no doubt whatever as to the mental condition of the infant; that it was an idiot of what we call the Mongolian type, because it resembles in its features the Mongolian. I may say that any doctor who has ever been unfortunate enough to be confronted at a maternity case with one of those idiotic children, never forgets it. They all, in a measure, look alike. It is a pitiable thing to see, and there was the picture that all of us had seen before.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Just there, do you allege the roster doctor in England had the same knowledge which you had afterwards?—A. Well, I presume that the child was brought to his office. It was an examination by a roster doctor, and I suppose the child was brought to his office for examination along with the mother.

Q. In other words, you are then reflecting upon the roster doctor?—A. Not necessarily.

Q. Oh, well, yes?—A. Just a moment. He examined the child several months before when it was much younger, and these things are progressive. Unless he were particularly familiar with idiotic infants, he may not have looked for that condition in the infant when he examined the mother, because it was seven or eight months before the child came to Canada that it was examined by this doctor in England.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. The condition was pretty general, was it not?—A. Oh, yes.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. You saw the child after it was sent back?—A. Yes, in London.

By Mr. Vallance:

Q. How old is the child now?—A. I think the child would be about sixteen months now. The trouble does not develop as an ordinary child. That is an indication to the parent, as a rule, that there is something wrong.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Do you think it is possible in a case where a woman went with three or four healthy boys and had a small child in her arms that the roster doctor might never have examined the child at all?—A. It might have happened in that way. I think that is all I have to say, unless someone has some further questions.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Is any record kept in cases where the condition of the immigrant would throw doubt upon a proper medical examination having been made in England,

[Dr. David A. Clark.]

so as to enable you to check back to the roster doctor who had examined him?—A. Oh, yes. The roster doctor makes out a form which goes along with the immigrant, so it is easily ascertained who the doctor is and where he lives.

Q. Would it be a good thing when a report of that kind is found to strike that doctor off the list and not accept his further examinations?—A. Of course, if we had a case of a doctor making a report which was not correct, we would certainly not place much confidence in any further reports of his, but all of them still have the opportunity of shading their reports very materially, and we have had ample evidence that many reports were shaded and, as I gave you the figures a moment ago, it was quite manifest that the whole of the doctors were not living up to the standard of immigration which we, in Canada, thought would prevent our institutions being loaded up with types of undesirable immigrants.

By Mr. Cahan.

Q. Doctor, is it not quite possible that the latent and congenital disposition for becoming insane may be utterly concealed from the most efficient medical observer and yet, under new environments and under new conditions, under the vexations and irritations which come to an immigrant who is not quite successful, this insanity or feeble-mindedness will be developed?—A. You will have to draw a distinction between insanity and feeble-mindedness. They are quite different. Feeble-mindedness is a congenital condition; insanity is a disease.

Q. Is not feeble-mindedness a disease?—A. No, I do not think any psychiatrist would agree to that.

Q. But is it not a fact that under these new conditions and new environments in Canada these symptoms might develop unexpectedly?—A. You are opening one of the deepest and most intricate problems of the psychiatrist. Some psychiatrists will contend that an individual is potentially insane from birth; others will contend that insanity is a disease similar to any other disease with which man may be afflicted, and it develops during the course of the individual's life. I am not a psychiatrist and am certainly not able to draw the nice distinctions which psychiatrists themselves have not been able absolutely to determine.

Q. But until the facts are returned through a series of years under what you suggest as the improved method of examination, you would not be able to tell whether this improved examination would eliminate those?—A. I am quite sure we will get more than the other fellows do.

By Mr. Arthurs.

Q. Have you had complaints directly or indirectly to your office that there was a lack or slackening off of British immigrants here since your doctors went over to take the place of the roster doctors?—A. I do not think we have had any direct complaints to our office, but there have been very many contentions that it is falling, and, as I pointed out a little while ago, the only method of comparison we have to estimate whether it is falling off or not is in those types of immigrants which it was necessary to examine last year and the previous years, as well as now, the assisted passage. We have conducted as many, and up to last week a little bit more each month than we conducted last year.

Q. That does not prove anything. What is the average age of the doctors sent over to England, roughly speaking? Are they young men or old men?—A. I would say that the average age is about 32.

Q. Comparatively young men?—A. Yes, recent graduates.

Q. And do they know more than the English doctors?—A. They know more about Canadian conditions. I would not say they are better physicians.

Q. Are they sent over to study Canadian conditions?—A. They are sent over to find men who will be suitable for Canada.

Q. In what way?—A. Mentally and physically.

Q. They have to make a physical examination?—A. Yes.

Q. There is nothing about Canadian conditions in that.—A. Canadian conditions demand a certain degree of physical fitness which the English doctors failed to appreciate.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Do you think these young men sent over would be a little inclined to be slightly obtrusive or a little bit domineering?—A. Not at all. I observed their attitude in many examinations, and the contrary was quite the condition which prevailed. As Mr. Forke said this morning, this lady who made the objection to her examination said that the doctor who examined her was most kind and she did not want to make any complaint which would get him into trouble.

Q. Do you really think that is true?—A. I do.

Q. It is surprising how all these reports and rumours and statements in the press find their circulation.—A. I would still draw the distinction between statements in the press and actual conditions.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Would your experience in the past lead you to say that the roster doctor is inclined to be a little lenient when examining one of his own patients?—A. Yes, I have said before that we have ample evidence that many of their reports have been shaded to some extent.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Is it true that the transportation companies, for their own benefit, have another examination after your doctors examine the immigrants coming to Canada?—A. No, I do not think that is true.

Q. Is it true that they have another examination?—A. Yes, on the Continent they have.

Q. Have you had cases where a man passed by your doctors under the present Act or regulations has been afterwards refused by the doctors of the transportation companies?—A. Not for any physical or mental defects. They have refused to let them on shipboard because they have developed an infectious disease in the interval. There were reports of four persons sent forward from Antwerp by the transportation company whom they said their doctors had stopped at shipboard after they had been passed by our doctor. It was true they had done it, but not for mental or physical conditions, but on account of an infectious disease which had developed in the interval between our examination and that of the ship's medical men.

Q. Have there been any cases in Great Britain?—A. Not that I know of. There would very likely be cases in which, as I pointed out a little while ago, the Board of Trade doctors might stop someone on account of an infectious disease, but that has nothing to do with immigration. It had developed in the interval. Sometimes four months will elapse between our examination and a person sailing.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. What is the practice in the United States? Do they have any inspection of their immigrants?—A. Yes, the United States have a number of doctors in England, Great Britain, Ireland and the Irish Free State. I am not certain of the exact number but I know there are as many as thirteen; all Americans; all members of the staff of the Public Health Service of the United States. They are stationed at London, Dublin, Southampton, Cobh, in Ireland, Belfast, I

think, Liverpool, and the important points throughout Great Britain. I am not familiar with them all.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. In the case of the tourist, he can go without the United States doctor; it is not compulsory for him to go there?—A. No.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. In effect they are following the same practice as you are?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. In the case of a tourist, he is going to pay his own passage?—A. We have nothing to do with tourists or transmigrants.

By Mr. Dubuc:

Q. Could not some of these men whom you would refuse come as tourists?—A. That is a matter for the Immigration Department to pick them up and send them back.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. They can come here and be deported if they stay too long?—A. Exactly.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Have any come from the United States?—A. Yes, they have.

By Mr. Dubuc:

Q. On tourist tickets?—A. No, not tourists. The tourists are just looked over.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. On their quota visé, have they not got to have medical certificates with them?—A. On their quota visé, yes.

Q. It is compulsory on emigrants from Great Britain to the United States to be medically examined in Great Britain?—A. Yes, it effects that, absolutely; that purpose.

Q. Then that does not affect what you are now talking about?—A. It effects the same purpose.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Would it not be possible to have the photograph taken at the same time the doctor has the examination?—A. It would be or it might be.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I know what the conditions are over in Great Britain. Could not almost anyone take a photograph?—A. Yes, everybody carries a camera, nearly.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. I have a case here that I would like to present to the Doctor and let him discuss it, with regard to a family brought out in the month of September last. Would they be examined by a Roster Doctor?—A. A Roster Doctor, yes. That would be previous to any of our doctors being in England.

Q. This is the case of the McGranm family. I had the file the other day and I would like to give you the medical report of the doctor in Alberta who examined the children, and to base some questions on it. In this case a man and

his wife and seven children were brought out.—A. That would be an assisted passage?

Q. Yes. They were brought out by the Scottish Emigrant Aid Society. I do not know who paid the assistance in that case. The assistance was paid first by the society and the reports are here on some of the children, that is medical reports made by the doctors in Alberta. They are as follows:—

Elizabeth McGrann. When this child came to us on August 9th she was suffering from a very bad strabismus in the left eye. Her eye was turned in very far towards the nose. Sight fair in right eye, but very little in left eye.

Then it goes on to say she was operated on by a doctor in Calgary and was in the Red Cross Hospital for some months, and the report continues:—

The child was in very bad shape physically, with very bad tonsils and adenoids. These were removed.

Then it states that she had been furnished with glasses. Then there is a report on "Tommy McGrann".

Height 4'2", weight 72 lbs., age 16 years. He is very anemic, has a bad tonsil on the left side, has a goitre, and has a serious condition of the heart. Generally speaking he is undersized, poorly nourished and generally unfit to carry on the work that he is doing at the present time.

Mary McGrann. Age 11, weight 64 lbs. She is in a very fair state of health with the exception that both tonsils are diseased and she has adenoid growths, a mouth breather and I believe that her health would be much benefited by removing the diseased tonsils and adenoids.

David. Age 18 months, weight 30 lbs. He is a fairly good specimen of a child in every way, but under the conditions which he is being brought up there is no doubt that in time that he will be on a par with the rest of the family.

Joseph McGrann. Age 7 years, height 3'10", weight 43 lbs. Mouth breather, tonsils enlarged, one is septic, adenoids present, two teeth upper right, and one tooth upper left decayed, and some enlargement of cervical glands. Child is undernourished.

Nicholas McGrann. 4 years, 3'5" in height, weight 35 lbs. With the exception of enlarged tonsils this child is in good condition.

Francis McGrann. Age 14 years. Undernourished and had the most septic and ragged tonsils I have ever seen in a child's mouth.

I have gone hurriedly over the doctor's report. I think it would be of great assistance to the Committee if you would give us your opinion of whether a doctor who had examined a family which was found on arrival in Alberta to be in such a condition should not be struck off the list and afterwards his examinations refused, or families refused from his examinations. In the report sent me by the municipality which has been trying to get someone to look after the family, they say that Mr. McGrann states he paid £2 for the doctor's fee for examining the family before they came over?—A. I think, gentlemen, that that case exactly bears out my contention that the Roster Doctor—because it must have been a Roster Doctor who examined this family—it was an examination made there—shades his report in favour of his own people. I do not think that that could happen with our doctors now. If it did, I think the doctor that did that would be very promptly replaced.

[Dr. David A. Clark.]

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. As to the work of the Roster Doctors, were not the emigrants examined afterwards by our doctors here in Canada?—A. They might have been inspected, but that was the whole of our examination. Tripping up the gang plank as they came, there was no possibility of examining them properly. That was the reason for establishing these examinations overseas, that they might make real examinations. As to examinations in Canada, while we had very astute doctors, it was nothing but an inspection; they looked at them and then they passed on.

Q. Could not that happen with any country that has direct service to Canada?—A. If anyone arrives in Canada now without a card of identity of a visé on their passports from our examining doctors, they are not passed through inland as they were before. Each and everyone of them is physically examined in a room by our examining doctors in the port. We have doctors here and when they arrive here they are examined here if they have not been overseas. They are really examined and not merely inspected as they were previously.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Do you think in this case the family ought to be deported?—A. That is a matter for the Immigration Department. If you refer it to the Immigration Department and they ask for the opinion of the Health Department, if that is the principle approved, they will be very glad to make an examination of each and every one.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Approximately, how many have been deported?—A. Last year, 590; 579 the year before.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Because a man has been turned down on inspection, that does not mean that he will make a good examination in the room?—A. Exactly so. It does not mean that.

Q. Do they pay for these examinations?—A. All examinations are absolutely free. That is a great saving to the emigrant. We figure that if we had put in effect a roster examination in England, and the Roster Doctors had been paid the same fee that they were being paid for assisted passages, it would have cost the Government of Canada just as much money to pay the Roster Doctors as pays our own staff over there.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Does that free examination apply whether they are finally accepted or not?—A. Yes, absolutely; it applies to everybody, and these emigrants bring to Canada all the money saved, which in the other event would have been paid to the Roster Doctor, and it is no inconsiderable sum when you consider 150,000 emigrants.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. As regards the examination of those who come over on their own, the ordinary Englishman who wants to come to Canada, must he be examined by your doctor?—A. Absolutely, if he is coming as an emigrant.

Q. No matter whether he is in the ordinary emigrant class or not, must he pass as an emigrant?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: He may come as a tourist.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Have you anything regarding that, the fact that they must be examined, even if paying their own passage?

[Dr. David A. Clark.]

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Before you answer that. An immigrant is a man or woman who comes to Canada with the intention of staying here. Some people do not.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Have there been any complaints along that line?—A. I have not seen any complaints in the Department, and I have not been told by anyone in the Department that there were any complaints.

Q. Do you read the papers?—A. Sometimes. I have no doubt that there have been some wonderful stories in the newspapers.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Does the Roster Doctor service apply as well in Scotland or Ireland as in England?—A. It did, yes.

Q. And is your Canadian medical examination now given in Ireland as well as in England?—A. In Northern Ireland, yes, and at Cobh Island, at Queens-town, we have an Irish doctor doing the work there, on a part time basis, because the emigration from Cobh, from Southern Ireland has not been extensive enough to warrant the placing of a full time doctor there up to the present.

By Mr. Rowe:

Q. Has the cost of inspection in the Old Country by the new system been much in excess of the old?—A. Do you mean examining the emigrants and paying the fee that was formerly paid to the Roster Doctor for assisted passages?

Q. Yes.—A. Would that be much in excess of the money paid to our doctors?

Q. The cost to the department of our doctors?—A. We figure that it would be about the same. As estimated \$190,000 is the cost of the Immigration Service abroad for the year. That I think you will see will be the amount in the estimates for this year's service.

Q. It has been indicated by evidence already submitted to the Committee, that that inspection is resented by a great many emigrants or intending emigrants from the Old Land. Would it not be possible to take the matter up with the British Government in order to have a more thorough inspection and have them inspect their own people before they leave?—A. Well, long before we inaugurated this service the matter was taken up with the British service, and the Deputy Minister in his examination before this Committee placed, I think, on the record a most splendid letter from the Hon. the Minister of Health of Great Britain, commending the plan. So that it has been discussed not only with the Hon. the Minister of Health in Great Britain but with the Hon. the Minister of Labour of Great Britain, and it has been approved by all the heads of government, so far as I know, with whom it was discussed in Great Britain.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. What is the usual practice in regard to returning Canadians who have been over there a few months on a visit and are coming back?—A. If they are returning Canadians, we have nothing to do with them.

Q. One of our members of parliament made the statement lately that he had to answer a great many questions upon a paper before he sailed?—A. A prominent official of the Canadian Pacific Railway, coming to Canada, being brought home to Canada, came in to our doctors and presented himself for examination without telling who he was. They examined him, of course. I wish to say this, gentleman, if I may; in the article in the *London Times*, which was full of inaccuracies one of the statements made was that all intending emigrants had to reply to some 90 or 92 questions, some 90 questions on a medical form.

There is no medical form of that kind. The intending emigrant is not required to answer any questions on any form. The only form which is made out (and the emigrant has nothing to do with it) is this: this is the report of the medical officer examining the emigrant; he simply puts down the surname, the Christian name, the address, whether male or female, married, single or a widower, the date of birth, nationality, height, weight, whether or not a pensioner, examined on such and such a date, and passed further, which means that they are held over for further examination, or they are certified. This is made up in triplicate; the doctor retains one, and he hands one to the Emigration Officer at the central point in the area from which the emigrant is coming.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Doctor, can you mention any regulation under which a person in Great Britain, although he may be a Canadian, must have a certificate from your officers before the transportation company is allowed, under the present regulations to take him?—A. I do not know of any such requirement.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Would you mind giving us the name of the individual who went in and asked to be examined?—A. If the Committee wishes it, I can give it.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. You said something about health examination; what about the civil examination forms for assisted passages?—A. That is, of course, another matter. There would be a number of forms for assisted passage.

By the Chairman:

Q. Here is Mr. Glen, a Scotsman; suppose he goes back to Scotland and stays a month or two, what procedure would he have to follow in order to get back to Canada?—A. Get on the ship. I am talking of Old Country men.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Suppose I go to Scotland for a visit and want to come back again, what do I do?—A. I take it for granted that you have been examined already. You would have nothing to do, so far as we are concerned.

Q. Just to buy my ticket; is that what you say?—A. So far as the medical service on emigration are concerned, that is all you would have to do.

By Mr. McMillan:

Q. It is the same as it always was?—A. The same as it always was, so far as we are concerned.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. If I am coming back, so far as your Department is concerned I do not need to bother about it?—A. You do not need to bother about it.

Q. But so far as the examination is concerned which Mr. Stevens spoke about in the House, have you anything to do with that?—A. Nothing whatever. We are the medical advisers on emigration, and we only advise in medical matters.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. I think you would have to fill up a landing card; that is all he would have to do?—A. That is all he would have to do, to fill up the landing card.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that all you wish to ask Dr. Clark?

(Witness retired.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, May 11, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., Mr. J. L. Brown, presiding.

A. L. JOLIFFE called.

By the Chairman:

Q. What is your full name?—A. A. L. Joliffe.

Q. And your position?—A. Commissioner of Immigration.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, on instructions of the minister I proceeded overseas in February last for the purpose of enquiring into the question of the present system of medical inspection in effect in the British Isles and on the continent of Europe, for the purpose of establishing whether that system was working satisfactorily, and if not, what difficulties were being encountered and how those difficulties could be adjusted. My instructions from the Minister were that I was to enquire into this matter as carefully as possible and on my return present a report giving exactly what I found in as fair and unbiassed a manner as possible. I have endeavoured to do that, and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall read my report. This report is dated April 12, 1928, and is addressed to the Deputy Minister:

Having completed a careful enquiry into the operation of the present system of medical inspection in the British Isles and on the Continent of Europe, I beg to submit herewith my report covering the same.

The present system of medical inspection in the British Isles and on the Continent of Europe did not come into full effect until February 15, 1928. Immigrants sailing from the British Isles during November, December, January and the first half of February could either receive medical examination prior to embarkation or at the Canadian port of entry; medical inspection prior to embarkation became obligatory on and after the date mentioned. Twenty-four medical officers were assigned for the work of medical inspection, of which number eighteen were located in the British Isles and six at Continental ports. The medical officers in the British Isles were assigned to the various areas into which the country had been divided for immigration purposes, the headquarters of the various units being in cities where immigration agencies were located. As the result of discussions between Health Department and Immigration officials and general enquiries with regard to the suitability of centres for medical examination, an itinerary was worked out whereby the whole country was covered by medical officers being at the various centres at specified dates and hours. The centres decided upon were as follows:—

England	183
Wales	25
Scotland	63
Northern Ireland	61

 332

In order to take care of certain outlying districts as, for instance, the Channel Islands, outlying islands of Argyllshire, Shetlands, Hebrides, etc., it was decided that medical examinations would be arranged by special appointment. For the Irish Free State medical examination was arranged at Cobh prior to embarkation and passengers from this State sailing from Belfast, Londonderry or Liverpool could be examined at these ports of embarkation if they so desired. Provision was also made for medical officers to be available at all the regular ports of embarkation in the British Isles so that immigrants (other than those coming forward under the Assisted Passage Arrangement) could, if they so desired, pass medical inspection at the port.

The first itinerary was completed and issued in October and covered the months of November, December, January, February and March. It was recognized that adjustments would be necessary as the result of the practical working out of the scheme; hence the first itinerary covered only a comparatively short period, the intention being to issue a second itinerary effective from April 1st with whatever adjustments were needed.

Attached hereto and marked 'Attachment A' is a printed copy of the first medical itinerary, which indicates under the name of each examining centre the actual place, dates and hours for examination.

In order to ascertain what objections were raised to the procedure and the difficulties which had arisen, if any, as well as the actual results, I interviewed a number of officials of the various steamship lines, officials of the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railways, as well as officers of the Departments of Immigration and Colonization and Health who were actually supervising and performing the inspectional work. I visited all agencies in England, in Scotland and Northern Ireland, and also the Continental agencies at Paris, Antwerp, Rotterdam, Hamburg and Danzig. Among those interviewed were:

- Mr. D. Johnston, Manager of the Colonization Department of the Canadian National Railways, London.
- Mr. A. McOwen, Superintendent of the Colonization, Department of the Canadian National Railways, Glasgow.
- Sir Geo. McL. Brown, European Manager of the Canadian, Pacific Railway Company, London.
- Col. Dennis, Chief Commissioner of the Colonization Department, Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
- Mr. Ewan Moore, Manager of the Colonization Department, Canadian Pacific Railway, London.
- Mr. S. J. Lister, General Manager, Cunard Line, Liverpool.
- Mr. A. B. Cauty, General Manager, White Star Line, Liverpool.
- Mr. S. Pellew, General Manager, Anchor-Donaldson Line, Glasgow.
- Mr. J. Buchanan, Manager, White Star Line, Glasgow.
- Mr. Cummings, Local Manager, Anchor Line, Glasgow.
- Mr. Robins, White Star Line, London.
- Major Duffy, Manager, Canadian Pacific Railway Company in Scotland, Glasgow.

The following is a brief summary of the result of my interviews with the various transportation companies' officials. It was stated that:—

1. There has been a great deal of adverse publicity to the new system in the British Press and that the present procedure was interpreted in Britain as being an irksome regulation.
2. There is a marked decline in migration to Canada this year and whilst it was not definitely stated that medical inspection is responsible for

the same, the impression was left that the system in question had affected migration to Canada.

3. The previous system whereby 1,500 roster doctors were available for the examination of immigrants was much more satisfactory as persons to be examined were not under the necessity of travelling any distance and there was a distinct advantage in the applicants being able to appear for examination on practically any day and at hours convenient to themselves.

4. A number of places arranged for medical examination are unsatisfactory. Instances were cited where persons coming up for examination after waiting for hours were required to leave without an examination and come up a second time.

5. The present system increases the number of interviews with Government officials, which is not desirable.

6. The necessity of obtaining photographs works a hardship, in some cases in rural districts necessitating an extra journey to town.

7. British migrants prefer the Roster Doctor, who is frequently the family physician, as against a strange medical man.

8. Medical inspection in Britain for passengers paying full fare should not be enforced as the same will be resented and prevent the migration of desirable settlers.

I was not successful in obtaining from the officials interviewed any positive evidence in support of their opinions.

The General Managers of the White Star and Cunard Lines have furnished a memorandum which is attached hereto and marked 'Attachment B'."

LIVERPOOL, March 8, 1928.

Attachment 'B'.

A. L. JOLIFFE, Esq.,

Commissioner of Immigration for Canada,
The Canadian Building,
Trafalgar Square,
London, S.W. 1.

Emigration to Canada

DEAR SIR,

We were glad to have an opportunity of a discussion with you yesterday on this important question, and in response to your kind suggestion, would submit to you the various points referred to in our conversation, which we feel have a very strong bearing on the extraordinary existing depression in British emigration to Canada this year as compared with the experience of previous years.

In this connection, we think it well to enclose you copy of a communication we addressed to Mr. J. Bruce Walker, Director of Emigration to Canada, dated 22nd ultimo.

Whilst we have recruited this present season a large number of prospective settlers, there is considerable delay in the issue of the Warrants. This may be attributed to the procedure at present in operation whereby all cases have to be approved by one or other of the Canadian Government representatives. In the past, authority was vested in the Colonization Departments of the Canadian Railways as well as in certain experienced Representatives of the Transportation Companies, to approved cases. It is felt that if such an arrangement could again be granted, it would facilitate the handling of assisted passages as compared with the present arrangement where the approvals are confined to the one channel.

[A. L. Jolliffe.]

There is apparently a feeling amongst prospective settlers, undoubtedly largely broadcast, that the requirements of the Government are exacting and onerous, involving dissatisfaction and inconvenience, as is evidenced by the cases referred to in the attached copies of communications—exhibits Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. It is apparent that cases of dissatisfaction, owing to present requirements, are widely spread and undoubtedly have an unfortunate influence on emigration to Canada.

With regard to the new arrangement in respect of medical examination, whilst we and our representatives have accorded the closest co-operation in this connection, reports are reaching us from various sources proving that the present procedure is regarded with disfavour.

Formerly, a large number of Roster Doctors were appointed who were accessible at any time in the evening. It is obvious that the present limited number of Medical Officers attending at specific, and, in many cases, unsuitable times, on given dates, cannot carry out the examinations with the facility of the former arrangements.

It is true that the examining fee has been waived, but the fact of passengers having in many cases to incur rail fare, and also get time off from their ordinary vocation, involves them in an expenditure in excess of what was formerly involved, in addition to which inconvenience, they are obliged to expose their intentions to their present employers.

In the past a photograph has not been called for, and this requirement entails additional inconvenience and expense to the passenger which is undoubtedly resented, and it is hoped this new formality can be dispensed with.

We also view the arrangement of applying the Medical Examination to full fare paying passengers with much concern, as this creates in the mind of the prospective settler, and whom Canada may welcome in view of his eligibility, an additional obstacle which did not previously exist and which does not apply to other Dominions and Colonies.

Whilst it is true that an examination has always applied in respect of such third class passengers on arrival in Canada, this has been accepted as a usual procedure, whereas the additional medical requirement on this side it is felt will be, and has already been, regarded as a discouragement against emigration to Canada.

We would, therefore, submit the view that the Medical Inspection by the Canadian Government Officers on this side should be restricted to assisted or Empire Settlement Act passengers, bearing in mind that the companies have their own Medical Representatives in addition to their Ships' Surgeons, who, in the interests of the Lines, are instructed to see that none but eligible passengers are accepted for transportation.

Yours faithfully,

WHITE STAR LINE,

(Signed) A. B. CAUTY.

THE CUNARD STEAM SHIP COMPANY, LIMITED

(Signed) S. J. LISTER.

LIVERPOOL, February 22, 1928.

J. BRUCE WALKER, Esq.,
Director of European Immigration,
Canadian Building,
London, S.W. 1

Emigration to Canada

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your inquiry as to causes for the existing depression in emigration to Canada, and the desire expressed by you that we should speed up the development of applications for passages under the Empire Settlement Act, we would say that the decline in the movement, as compared with previous years, is also giving us very much concern, and we are glad to have the opportunity of giving you our views on the situation.

We have been very actively engaged since October last in recruiting prospective settlers for Canada to go out this year, and have been successful in securing a large number of applicants. These cases have been submitted promptly for approval, but up the present the notification we have received of acceptances represents less than 5 per cent of the total.

Whilst it has become more or less common knowledge since the war that anyone wishing to travel has to comply with various formalities, the Canadian Immigration Form, containing as it does 24 questions, is in itself looked upon as a formidable document to complete. There is in addition the Medical Examination, and when a prospective settler has got through with these, and the case has been submitted by us for approval, without result for many weeks, the applicant becomes discouraged and the effect in his district is deadening.

We gathered from your inquiry the other day that you appreciated the difficulty this was causing and that your Department would be less strict in regard to the completion in exact detail, of the various documents before the cases are dealt with, but we are to-day in receipt of your communication of the 21st instant emphasizing the necessity for having all the blanks on an application form correctly filled in, together with certificate of identity, photograph and references, and emphasizing that to omit any one will involve great delay and inconvenience to the passenger.

We have no wish to question your suggestion that we should circularize agents on this point without delay and are arranging accordingly, but coupled with the extraordinary delay in the approving of cases already submitted, we are satisfied that this further communication to agents will act as an additional brake on emigration to Canada, and we feel that the time and money we have expended in endeavouring to work up this movement is likely to have but poor results.

We would not like you to feel that our view of the situation is narrow or prejudiced, and attach a cutting from the *Glasgow Evening News* of Saturday last, which is characteristic of paragraphs that have appeared in various papers recently, all in the same tenor, and which we think correctly indicated the feeling throughout the country and which obviously must act as a deterrent on emigration to Canada.

The reports from agents and others that are reaching us through our Travelers would indicate that the new form of medical examination is regarded with disfavour. It would appear that there is diffidence on the part of prospective settlers to take advantage of the present procedure in respect of medical examination, despite the fact that the fee has been abolished, on account of the hesitancy on the part of the individual to divulge to his employer his intentions in respect of emigration. This
(A. L. Jolliffe.)

it is contended he must necessarily do in order to get the time off to make arrangements for medical examination, which circumstance, it is suggested, did not apply under the old regime where the Roster Doctor was available at almost any suitable point and at times convenient to the passenger. Apart from this the Canadian Government Medical Examination did not apply previously to full paying passengers, which appears to be an additional and unnecessary condition.

To pass from this to a more personal indication, we enclose copy of a letter from a prospective passenger at Halifax. You will see that this man after making strenuous but unsuccessful efforts to emigrate to Canada, has thrown up the whole idea in disgust, although he was a full paying passenger and one able to take care of himself on arrival there. For this one case which has been brought so prominently before us there must be dozens of a similar character, and under the methods now in force we feel satisfied that the movement to Canada will gradually decline to negligible proportions, notwithstanding the urgency from the British point of view of emigration from this country. The tendency to-day, of course, will be to swing the movement over to Australia where the formalities are less rigid and exacting.

Yours faithfully,

WHITE STAR LINE,

(Signed) A. B. CAUTY.

THE CUNARD STEAM SHIP COMPANY, LIMITED.

(Signed) S. J. LISTER.

GLASGOW EVENING NEWS

SATURDAY, February 18.

EMIGRATION MADE UNEASY

Canadian Railways are at the moment advertising in this country that they want 4,500 men by April 15 for land work in the Dominion. There are many other Canadian Agencies doing their best to attract men and women emigrants across the sea. The Prince of Wales, the Prime Minister, and many eager Empire builders by proxy have been eloquently depicting the work, vast possibilities of development in Canada. The urgent need for increased man power to make the most of it and the desirability of ensuring that as large a proportion as possible of that man power should be drawn from this country.

The preference of the Dominion Governments for British emigrants and markedly for Scottish emigrants during many generations has not been solely influenced by sentiment. It is mainly due to the acknowledged fact that they have always made the best settlers, and for obvious reasons, best assimilate with native born Canadians.

Canada is larger than the United States or China, with much greater natural resources than either. Yet it only has a population of about ten millions, as compared with the United States 120 millions, China's 445 millions and Great Britain's 47 millions. It might reasonably be expected that in these circumstances every encouragement would be given by the Canadian government to the acceleration of migration from our little Islands. Canada in the past was colonized to a great extent—so far as it is colonized—by Northern Europeans who found no obstacles put in the way of their migration, and if the Dominion to-day is a land of brawny men and good citizens, it is not because any eugenic or moral perfection was insisted upon in the case of their ancestral pioneers.

[A. L. Jolliffe.]

The aim hitherto of Canadian Governments was to make the emigrants' transfer from Great Britain to the New World as easy as possible. When in more recent times Canada has become fastidious about the standard of its immigrants and has insisted upon picking and choosing them, we have cheerfully acquiesced and even aided in picking out the physical weeds.

Apparently Canadians are not satisfied now that we are giving them the very best plums in our basket. It is something of an insult to the Medical Officers of this country and to its Shipping Companies that a new and irritating system of examination is coming into force. A corps of about thirty doctors from Canada is to be distributed over the whole of the British Islands from John O'Groats to Land's End, and from the Welsh Coast to the North Sea. All intending emigrants will in future have to hunt out these Doctors, submit to a searching physical examination and secure photographs and passports, before they can get on board ship for Canada. Hunting the Canadian Doctor is a new sport our people will have to train for more actively than tossing the caber, and for the tug-of-war at Highland gatherings. It is estimated that every immigrant we send to Canada represents £1,000 of an investment, which, unfortunately, cannot be realized at home. If Canada really wants them in a reasonable time this new red tape performance is likely to defeat her ends.

COPY OF REPORT FROM STEAMSHIP COMPANY'S TRAVELER DATED LIVERPOOL, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1928

Re Canadian Medical Examination

The Canadian Government Doctor who visits Douglas, Isle of Man, appears to take a very high standard.

Agent Bean had a domestic (J. Power) turned down on medical grounds, and he reports that she was set a mathematical sum to do, and she did not do it, evidently was not of the right type.

I saw this woman myself last October and thought her the usual average domestic, and later she was seen by Mr. Perdue, C.G.A. Liverpool, who evidently approved of her.

I am informed that this woman is a good domestic, spoken very highly of by her employer, a solicitor of good standing, but evidently she is not mathematician enough to go to Canada. I understand that this is not the only case where sums have been set and evidently used as a test of mental powers.

Explanation

This domestic was certified by the Medical Officer as having Mitral Stenosis and Diastolic Murmur (double heart disease); heart enlarged to the left; compensation fair. Mentally dull; actual age 34, mental age 12. Examined January 3, 1928.

(Signed) A. L. J.

COPY OF REPORT FROM STEAMSHIP COMPANY'S TRAVELLER
DATED 23RD FEBRUARY, 1928

Mr. Bird of Messrs. King and Bird of Mansfield informed me that a number of his prospective passengers proceeded to Nottingham on Wednesday last for medical examination and owing to the large number of applicants assembled for examination has to return to Mansfield with-

[A. L. Jolliffe.]

out seeing the Doctor. He stated that he understood the examination was done by a lady doctor. At 2.30 p.m. she had to leave, I understand, for Coalville.

It is estimated that at one time there were over 100 applicants assembled for examination.

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

MARCH 27th, 1928.

Explanation.

Mr. A. L. JOLIFFE,
Nottingham

In connection with the report received by you to the effect that one hundred persons turned up for examination at Nottingham on February 22nd, I beg to state that thirty-five persons were actually examined by our Medical Examiner and eight were requested to return for examination on the occasion of the next visit, as the Medical Examiner was unable to finish.

(Signed) H. B. JEFFS,
Chief Medical Officer.

Explanation.

Under the new itinerary additional time allowed at this point and extra day per month for medical examination.

(Signed) A. L. J.

COPY OF REPORT RECEIVED FROM STEAMSHIP COMPANY'S TRAVELLER
DATED DISS. 16TH FEBRUARY, 1928.

Canadian Medical Examination

Agent Lusher of Diss states that he had two boys under scheme, and they had to travel to Norwich for Medical Examination and be there by 4.45 p.m.

Their last train back is at 6.30 p.m. and apart from expense, time was all too short.

As there are some cases in hand from Interview at Diss last week, please arrange in co-operation with Agent Lusher of Diss, a prospective visit of a Canadian Doctor, approximately in a month's time.

March, Cambs

The position here is the same as at Diss—no visits for medical examination have been arranged. Ely and Wisbech are the nearest points for examination, but March is a natural centre, and it would be difficult and expensive for March applicants to go to Ely or Wisbech. Would it be possible for the Agents at Diss and March to write in to your Department and fix a date or for the Canadian Doctor to notify Agents that he will attend on a certain day or days so as to give the Agent sufficient time to get in touch with those cases likely to go forward.

East Anglia being very thinly populated has no bus service and very few trains. It is only on market days that people can get transit by carriers. The majority of the farm hands are 3 or 4 miles from the Railway Station: so it will be seen how difficult it is for a family to get into even their nearest market town.

[A. L. Jolliffe.]

All Agents naturally preferred the Roster Doctor system, country people not caring for strange and in many cases youthful doctors.

Explanation.

Under the new itinerary, examinations are to be conducted at Diss by appointment, effective from April 1.

No request was ever made to establish March as a medical centre. This point is only six miles from Wisbech, which is a medical examining point. Local doctor for East Anglia.

(Signed) A.L.J."

COPY OF LETTER FROM STEAMSHIP COMPANY'S AGENT AT DUNDEE, DATED
FEBRUARY 17, 1928.

CANADIAN INTERVIEWS BY DOCTOR

In this connection we are receiving very serious complaints. On Wednesday, 15th instant, all our clients were called to be at the Dispensary, 1, Tally Street, at 9.30 a.m., prompt. There was quite a large number drawn from Dundee and outlying districts and the accommodation we are told at 1, Tally Street, is simply disgraceful. Most of our clients in waiting required to sit upon damp, cold, dirty steps and furthermore although they appeared promptly at 9.30 a.m. it was 5 o'clock in the afternoon before the examination had been completed. Such a state of things cannot continue and we shall be glad if you will take steps to have same reported to the proper quarter.

One family in particular consisting of husband and wife with five children hung about all day long and were only examined at 5 p.m. Such conditions cannot possibly continue and we shall be glad to hear what can be done to remedy.

Explanation

The unsatisfactory conditions at Dundee have been adjusted. The Chief Medical Officer stated that the conditions had developed owing to the stupidity of the Medical Officer handling this point. There is no reason why arrangements could not have been made for a waiting room. The situation at Dundee is now satisfactory.

(Signed) A.L.J."

COPY OF LETTER FROM STEAMSHIP COMPANY'S TRAVELLER, DATED
ARBROATH, 15TH FEBRUARY, 1928.

Referring to your letter of the 8th instant, in which you stated that the Medical Officer would be in attendance at the Town Hall, Arbroath, yesterday, 15th, at 4.15 p.m.

We had several passengers wishing to see him for the purposes of having their cards of identity signed, they duly appeared at the Town Hall as stated and waited on until 6 o'clock and he never turned up.

We shall be pleased to know the circumstances and also if any other arrangements have been made, as some of these passengers are expecting to sail by 3rd March.

Explanation

There was difficulty at Arbroath as reported. The Doctor making this appointment was delayed owing to running out of blank certificate

forms. He wired to the Town Hall to hold the people until he arrived but apparently none remained. A special trip was made from Glasgow the following Monday to examine these people.

(Signed) A.L.J."

COPY OF LETTER RECEIVED FROM PROSPECTIVE PASSENGER 18TH
FEBRUARY, 1928. BY STEAMSHIP COMPANY'S TRAVELLER

Enclosed letter was forwarded from York, and as you see requires me to furnish something which will not be supplied to me by the Ministry of Pensions, as the Pensions Board Report in question was supplied to the Canadian Authorities on January 31st by the Ministry Award Branch of the Ministry of Pensions.

I was extremely disappointed because I could not sail yesterday and I feel disgusted at the whole affair. I did everything in my power to fulfil my contract with the Canadian Medical Department seem determined not to acknowledge the receipt of the Pensions Board Report and as I passed the Docks O.K. on January 10th I think the matter has gone far enough and I wish to cancel my passage altogether and trust that under the circumstances I shall be entitled to a refund of the whole amount of the money I paid in fares. Will you please forward these letters on to the White Star Office with my regrets.

Explanation

This refers to the case of Lawrence E. Jones. On requesting details from the White Star Line, information was furnished that this man had subsequently sailed on March 10th.

(Signed) A.L.J.

COPY OF REPORT FROM STEAMSHIP COMPANY'S TRAVELLER
DATED 27TH FEBRUARY, 1928

In reference to your letter of the 25th, Mr. Toft has arranged to work for Mrs. Green, Midnapore, Alta., and I would like to point out that he wanted to sail with Mr. Alfred Bradshaw on the *Celtic* March 10. He gave as reference Mr. John Weir, who, on receiving your enquiries, told Mr. Toft he would have to finish work for him on Saturday, February 25th, as he considered it was a dirty trick to leave him just as Spring was coming on. He is now out of employment and in lodgings so you will understand that he wants to get away as quickly as possible. It is not possible for him to go without waiting for Mrs. Green to nominate him, which would take at least six weeks to get through.

It will be next to impossible for him to get another place, if he wishes to leave it in about 2 months' time, and he does not like the idea of taking another place without being fair and above board. It seems to me that if he has got to wait for nomination that the case will fall through as he will be compelled to get a place. I may say that personally I think that this young man is the most suitable applicant in every way for Canadian Emigration that I have dealt with, and I feel that if this application fails, it is no use sending proposals at all.

Explanation

No difficulty developed in this case. Thomas B. Toft passed medical examination, his application was approved and he sailed on SS. *Celtic* from Liverpool March 10th.

IA. L. Jolliffe.

COPY OF REPORT RECEIVED FROM STEAMSHIP COMPANY'S TRAVELLER
DATED 27TH FEBRUARY, 1928.

Report on Canadian Medical Examination

I visited the Hulme Town Hall to-day and have to report as follows: Fare paying passengers taken first. Timed two families (man, wife and two children), one family 20 minutes the other 25 minutes. One single lady was at the above address from 1.45 till 4.25 waiting to be examined.

Understand that most of the people have been waiting on an average $1\frac{1}{2}$ to $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours.

Assisted passage applicants I found have been waiting since 1.30. Doctor started his examination of these people at 4.35 p.m. Understand from enquiries made that a fair number got tired of waiting and went away. This may account for the report that single men are not coming up for the Medical Examination. A lot of grumbling by those waiting.

The general idea I obtained from people waiting was that there should be two doctors at least in attendance or appointments made for definite times.

Explanation

Under new schedule Medical Officer will be one full day per week at this point and for rush season arrangements will be made for a second Medical Officer to be present should conditions warrant.

(Signed) A.L.J.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Have you given those as sample cases, or are those the complaints received?—A. No, sir, those were all the complaints that were received; that is from that source.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Does that cover all the stations in the British Isles?—A. That covers all the complaints these two companies had to make with regard to the British Isles.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Covering a period of how long?—A. From the start, sir, until the time I was there which was about March the 5th or 6th.

Q. That would be covering a period of about two weeks?—A. Yes, covering a period of about two weeks. (Reads):

I was informed by Col. Dennis, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that a meeting of a number of the company's travelling men was being held in London on March 20th, after which he would be in a position to state what effect the medical inspection was having on their work, and he promised to furnish me with particulars later. The only material furnished to date by Col. Dennis is a memorandum written by Major Hayward, who I understand handles boy migration for the Canadian Pacific Railway, in which some criticism appears regarding medical inspection as it affects boys. I did not have sufficient time prior to sailing to personally investigate the cases referred to but requested our London office to prepare a memorandum covering the facts, which has been done. The memoranda are appended hereto and marked 'Attachment C'.

The memorandum prepared by Major Hayward is as follows. (Reads):

LONDON, 17th March, 1928.

Colonel J. S. DENNIS, C.M.G.,
Chief Commissioner,
London.

re: Boy Migration

Up to the present moment 89 boys have sailed under the B.I.C.A. to Canada.

Besides these, we have 38 approved for the next sailing on the *Mont-calm* 30th March.

There are 97 cases over with the Canadian Government awaiting their approval; and there are another 46 being developed.

Up to the 20th February, great difficulty was experienced in getting boys approved, and shipments were badly delayed; but since that, approvals have been coming in very much better although not so readily as they had hitherto under the old arrangement of Roster doctors.

Besides the number quoted above, we have at present 13 boys who are awaiting re-examination for various complaints, principally eye trouble. Under the old system, we had very few of these; boys being either approved or rejected. This, of course, causes delay, and we would be glad if we could always be told of what the treatment required is to consist of and for what, when we would do our best to hasten matters. (See case of Greenwood.)

The chief causes for the delay under the present system of medical examinations are:—

1. The fact that the civil and medical examinations are not held at one and the same place and time, in many cases. (See files of Neave and Clark.)

2. Under the old system of Roster Doctors, a boy in employment could visit the doctor almost any day, and for many hours during that day, whereas, at the present moment, boys may be notified to visit a doctor a long way away from their work and at a time which conflicts with same. (See case of Newman.)

3. The fact that the Canadian Doctors' visits to most parts of the provinces are at least a fortnight or a month apart must of course cause delay, as compared with the old system. If a boy cannot attend on his first notice he has to await the above period before he gets a second chance.

4. There seems to be a considerable delay between the time that a boy has been seen and handed his identity card by a doctor and the time that we are notified of his approval. This is caused no doubt by the Boys' Department of the Canadian Government not receiving notification from the Health Department of such examination, and may be unavoidable (See Newbery).

The most interesting point, however, that has arisen with regard to the new regulation is that in the past three years I have only had three boys rejected at the port of embarkation after their medical examination by the roster doctor, whereas, since the 1st January, this year, I have had four such rejections after examinations by the Canadian doctor. His causes, of course, a good deal of expense; and it is very hard on the boy and his parents.

(Signed) W. H. HAYWARD,

Special Representative.

[A. L. Jolliffe.]

The memorandum prepared by our London Office in connection with the one I have just read, is as follows. It is dated March 30:—

Before dealing with Major Hayward's complaints seriatim, may I refer to the first paragraphs of his letter.

Up to and including 3rd March this year, Major Hayward had sent 89 boys to Canada under the auspices of the B.I.C.A. Since the date of Major Hayward's letter, viz., March 17, 37 more boys have been accepted and others are still in hand. We have been compelled to concentrate on the boys already 17 years of age who must sail before the 31st of this month, in order to secure free transportation. About 80 boys have gone forward to the port to-day.

I was not aware that shipments had been delayed through difficulty having been experienced in getting the boys approved.

Major Hayward speaks of delay being caused through boys being re-examined and states that this did not happen when Roster Doctors were making the examinations. The truth is, that Major Hayward did not know what happened between the time that his papers reached us and the acceptance or rejection of the boys. He did not know how often our Medical Adviser wrote to the Roster Doctors on medical points, nor how often, after receiving the Roster Doctor's reply, the boy awaited our Medical Adviser's next visit to his neighbourhood before he was either approved or rejected. I presume Major Hayward would not prefer that we should definitely reject a boy, who is found to be suffering from trouble which is probably, if not certainly, curable!

Major Hayward refers to the boy named William E. Greenwood. He was found in December to be unfit for acceptance either by the Doctor or the Agent, but was told that if he had two months training it was quite probable that he would then be accepted. The training was given and the boy was accepted this month.

Dealing with Major Hayward's specific complaints.

1. When the new regulations first came into force I wrote to every Agent as follows:—

Will you kindly arrange to see the boys at points covered by the Medical Advisers' Itinerary, and will you please arrange to see them on days when our Medical Examiner will be in attendance at the spot specified.

Some of the Agents wrote pointing out that it would be very difficult. We wrote again saying that we must leave the matter in their hands but again urging them to do their best to prevent a boy spending money and losing time from business through having to make to journeys from his home to the place of interview. I have no doubt that the Agents have done their best to avoid duplicating the Boys' journeys—it is always avoided in the London District, but that is because Miss Priske has only boys' interviews to arrange; the Agents have to fit in the boys' interviews with interviews of every other kind.

Without the Christian name of the boy named Clark I regret it is impossible to refer to this case. Neave is not a B.I.C.A. boy at all. He was put forward by Major Hayward for the Macdonald College. He was seen by the Doctor on the 7th March and the Agent's report is dated the 8th March. There was certainly no time lost between the two examinations in this case.

2. It is true, of course, that the time of the doctors' visits to certain towns has been very awkward for boys at distances from the interviewing spot. In the case of George Newman, of Ashburton, he had a notice to see the doctor at Newton Abbott at an hour when it was impossible for him to get there.

[A. L. Jolliffe.]

Difficulties such as these will, no doubt, be overcome if they are placed before the Department of Health.

3. If Major Hayward would let us know of individual cases where hardship is done through the time elapsing between the Doctor's visits, we would place same before the Department of Health and no doubt a satisfactory solution could be arrived at.

4. I note that Major Hayward states that a long time elapses between the boy writing to him, telling him he has got his Identity Card, and the acceptance of this boy by this office. I can give you unquestionably the reason for this delay.

The boy is seen by the doctor and receives his Identity Card but the agent may not see him for some little time afterwards, and of course he cannot be accepted until the agent approves him. There is never any delay in the Department of Health sending out the copies of the doctors' reports.

The case of Newbery referred to by Major Hayward is a London case. This boy was examined by the roster doctor, interviewed and accepted last year. I do not know why Major Hayward delayed his emigration, but he sent us the Identity Card in February, 1928. Arrangements were made for this boy to be medically examined on March 6. A copy of the doctor's report reached this office on March 7 and was inadvertently treated as a new case owing to a misunderstanding in the Filing Room. Consequently, this boy, who might have been accepted on the 7th March, was not accepted until the 16th.

Major Hayward refers to boys having been rejected at the port, since the new regulations came into force. These rejections all took place before the issue of Identity Cards began and when the applicant chose whether he would go to a roster doctor or to a Canadian Medical Examiner.

Two boys were rejected by a C.P.R. doctor because they were found to be suffering from 'Marked Folliculitis' and, because it might have been Trachoma, the doctor rejected them, in spite of the fact that the Canadian doctor had passed them.

One boy was rejected for an abscess on his neck, which broke out after he had been examined, and another boy was found to have a high temperature. The abscess and high temperature could not possibly have been detected or foreseen at the time of the interview.

1. *Adverse Press Publicity*

The present system of medical inspection unquestionably received much adverse criticism in the British press, a considerable proportion of which appeared before the system had come into full operation and certainly prior to there being any possibility of judging the matter on its merits. Attached will be found a number of press clippings marked 'Attachment D' from which it will be observed that not only is the procedure condemned but the facts are not clearly or fairly presented. As an instance of this, one article states that intending immigrants are required to answer ninety questions on a form filled out in triplicate. Another makes the same statement and adds that fifty centres are to be selected for medical examinations. Another suggests that sixty persons may be examined in one centre and the balance will have to wait 'till the morrow if there be a morrow arranged.' It is further suggested that the European migrant will have an enormous advantage.

These statements are obviously incorrect. Immigrants do not require to answer ninety questions. It is a fact that assisted passage immigrants

are required to complete application forms; passengers paying full fare do not. The questionnaire filled in by applicants for passage assistance contains twenty-four questions, some of which are dual. The only other form filled out by immigrants is the declaration form which every immigrant to Canada is required to complete by the transportation company, thus furnishing such information as is required for the steamship manifest, which latter must be presented at the port of entry as required by law. This declaration form has been in use for years.

Instead of fifty centres as suggested in the press, there were 332 centres when the system came into effect and this number has since been increased.

The suggested advantage in European migrants does not exist.

2. Decline in Migration to Canada this Year.

It seems apparent that the movement of immigrants to Canada from the British Isles to date is smaller than last year. As our agencies in Britain did not come in contact last year with immigrants paying full fare, complete comparative figures could not be obtained. A comparison, however, can be made with regard to assisted passage cases and I give below figures showing the number of warrants issued for assisted passage during the months of January, February and March, 1927 and 1928:—

1927..	6,227
1928..	5,183

Decrease in 1928.. 1,044 or 16.7 per cent.

Since this report was made, we have received the figures for April, which reduced the figures from 16.7 per cent to 12.1 per cent.

A considerable proportion of the decrease is due to the fact that the quotas allotted to the Agents under the 3,000 Family Scheme are much smaller than last year. I understand the quota is 900 families less this year. Had the quota been the same as last year, the number of 1928 warrants issued would have been considerably increased. Another factor entering into the situation is that last year applications for farm labour secured by the transportation companies were passed on by officers of the two Canadian railways whilst this year all cases are handled by officers of the Department. In the opinion of our Agents, many cases were passed last year which had they come before the Department officials would have been refused.

In considering the question of decrease in migration during the period in question, it is of considerable interest to note that Canada is not the only country so affected. There has evidently been a general decline in the movement of emigrants from the British Isles during the first months of the present year as compared with the same months of 1927. In proof of this statement, I give below official figures as obtained covering three countries:—

Migrants to	1927			1928			Per cent decrease
	January	February	Total	January	February	Total	
Australia (Asst'd).....	3,233	2,670	5,903	2,313	1,993	4,306	27%
New Zealand (Asst'd).....	792	667	1,459	251	246	497	
United States.....	2,042	3,361	5,403	1,328	2,788	4,116	24%

The figures for New Zealand do not necessarily prove a slackening of migration to that country as there was a limitation on immigration in effect from April, 1927. The figures for Australia which cover assisted passage and for the United States show a material decrease in 1928.

Attachment "E" covers two letters from our Liverpool Agent giving the opinion of several representative booking agents regarding the decrease in migration. It will be observed that medical inspection is not put forward as one of the causes:—

102 New India Building,

Water Street,

Liverpool, 13th March, 1928.

DEAR MR. JOLIFFE,—Since you were here last week I have made it my business to seek the opinions of some representative Booking Agents regarding the cause of the decrease in our applications this season.

Mr. Bruce, the Manager of Messrs. Eason & Co., Lincoln, expressed the opinion that we had come to the end of those who were possible migrants at the conclusion of the war and those who have reached migration age since that time are satisfied with conditions here, more particularly as they know that if they fall out of employment they will not be entirely without means. Mr. Bruce had no complaint to make regarding our medical system.

Mr. Wood, the Manager of Dean & Dawson's, Lincoln, expressed the opinion that there was a scarcity of farm workers in the eastern counties; that farm workers generally in that part of the country are in demand and are being paid very fair wages. It is difficult to get these people to realize the opportunities Canada offers them in the future, particularly as they are fairly satisfied with conditions at the present time. He also expressed the opinion that the payment of unemployment benefits has had a very great effect on reducing the migration movement. He, too, expressed satisfaction with our medical system.

Mr. Bradley, of Boston, is one of the principal Agents in Lincolnshire. He is very active in all kinds of advertising and does not hesitate to use his own car to reach possible applicants promptly. Although at this time last year Mr. Bradley had booked a considerable number of passengers for Canada, when I called at his office last Wednesday he had yet to book his first ticket for Canada this season. He expressed himself unable to account for the poor response this year. (You also have a copy of Mr. Bradley's letter).

Mr. Weall, of Gainsborough, one of the oldest Shipping Agents in North Lincolnshire, expressed the opinion that we are suffering from a certain amount of adverse publicity in the press and unsatisfactory letters from Canada in circulation among friends of those who have emigrated, and he would like to see some publicity of a favourable character. This bears out the suggestion I made to you: that it would be an advantage if our publicity were more continuous throughout the year and if more inspiring paragraphs appeared in the news columns of the press to prepare people to receive our advertisements when they appear.

Mr. Johnston, of our Land Settlement Branch, who is temporarily assisting in this district, has read this letter and tells me the opinions expressed by the above Agents coincide with the opinions expressed to him at the offices he has visited and if Mr. Perdue were here I am satisfied he would make a similar statement.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) CHAS. A. ALLEN,

Canadian Government Emigration Agent.

[A. L. Jolliffe.]

The letter from Mr. Bradley referred to, is as follows:—

28th February, 1928.

DEAR SIR,—We have yours of the 25th instant and as requested we have had your advertisement inserted in the *Lincolnshire Standard* for 3rd March and enclose account for same.

We have been successful in getting the advertisement on the front page under Situations Vacant and if you propose to continue it for a further period we are asked to obtain your immediate instructions, there is no reduction for additional insertions as the advertisement is displayed.

With regard to your query *re* prospects for boys, we are sorry but the number of applicants for Canada this season up to the present has been very disappointing, we are inserting double our usual advertisements in both local papers but no results are being obtained and I cannot understand this and keep hoping the slump will end. We shall continue our efforts for the next two months and trust with better results.

We await the forms for boy applicants and you may rely upon us to send along to you as many as possible.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) A. BRADLEY.

Attachment "F" is a report from our Liverpool Agent enclosing clippings from various papers giving publicity to cases of failures in Canada. The comment of our Agent regarding these articles being referred to in small country districts and the effect of same on prospective migrants is interesting. To say the least, this class of publicity certainly does not encourage migration.

The letter referred to is dated March 16th, addressed to myself:

When you were in Liverpool you asked me to secure and send you copies of the articles which appeared in the Liverpool papers regarding the young men who came back as stowaways.

I am enclosing all the clippings I have been able to secure; copies of these and, I think, one or two others, were sent to London. You may be able to secure these from the London Office files 23.S.230 and 10.S.177.

When discussing this matter with you, I expressed the opinion that this publicity has had a disastrous effect on our work in the Liverpool district, more particularly among boys. I have had these newspaper articles quoted to me even in small country districts as far away as Lincolnshire. With such articles being published, it is not difficult to understand the hesitation of parents to give the required consent to a boy's migration, no matter how keen the boy may be to complete his application. My feeling is that when such articles as these appear, immediate and strong replies from our Publicity Department should be issued in the columns of the papers concerned, in order to immediately counteract the effect produced by the publication of adverse reports. I know it is not always possible to contradict immediately statements that may be made by one just returned from Canada, but I do contend that we have on file sufficient favourable reports which would make very good reading.

The figures are all set out in the statement marked exhibit "G" which is as follows:—

[A. L. Jolliffe.]

MEDICAL EXAMINATION IN BRITISH ISLES

Months	Number of Examinations			Number of cases passed	Result												
	Full fare cases	Asst. passage cases	Total		Number of cases certified Section 3, Subsections						Total certifications	Awaiting further report	Certified cases approved for admission				
					A		C	K	L	M			MM	C	L	M	
November, 1926.....		709	709	613	11	13	59	2	10	1	96					
November, 1927.....	3	248	251	200	4	3	26	4	6	1	44	7	8	6	
December, 1926.....		1,334	1,334	1,140	15	29	117	4	28	1	194					
December, 1927.....	10	1,028	1,038	860	21	9	72	11	30	5	148	30	6	28	
January, 1927.....		2,477	2,477	2,141	29	39	199	6	62	1	336					
January, 1928.....	144	3,498	3,642	3,147	36	12	308	26	1	81	464	31	43	1	6	
February, 1927.....		4,690	4,690	4,408	19	20	206	2	34	1	282					
February, 1928.....	1,581	5,706	7,287	6,607	59	22	427	32	108	648	32	103	106	

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Were no roster doctors working on this case in February, 1928?—A. Yes. It was possible for passengers up to February 15th to come forward on the roster doctor's examinations, that is, sailing from the port before February 15th.

Q. You have not compared the figures for March, 1928, with March, 1927?—A. No, I have not. (Reading).

The record of medical examinations during the months of January and February, 1928, for assisted passage cases indicates a marked increase in number over the same period for the year 1927, thus indicating that medical inspection in itself is not responsible for the decrease in assisted passage migration. Appended hereto and marked "Attachment G" will be found a comparative statement covering medical examinations for the months of November and December, 1926, and January and February, 1927, as compared with November and December, 1927, and January and February, 1928. Comparing assisted passage cases in January, 1927 (roster doctor examinations) as against January, 1928 (Canadian doctor examinations) it will be observed that the last mentioned examined over 1,000 more prospective assisted passage migrants than the roster doctors examined for the same month of the previous year and that in February, 1928, under the present system Canadian doctors examined 1,000 more assisted passage migrants than roster doctors examined in February, 1927.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Did the roster doctors examine only cases of assisted passages?—A. No, the roster doctors were examining before February, 1928, from November, I think, but the passengers embarking before February 15, 1928, did not necessarily have to have the Canadian officer's clearance. After February 15 it was compulsory for the Canadian officer's certificate to be obtained.

Q. Would there be a distinction then between the examination made by a roster doctor up to that time and the others? Your figures cover only the assisted passages up to February, 1928, whereas your figures now with the Canadian medical officers will cover not only assisted passages but all the others.—A. They cover all.

Q. Have you provided for that in your figures?—A. My figures show the assisted passage examinations and the full fare examinations. They are separated; they are all in the statement:

Convenience of Previous Roster Doctor System

It is, of course, quite true, looking at the matter strictly from the point of view of the migrant's convenience and taking nothing else into consideration, that in a percentage of the cases examination by a roster doctor would be more convenient but not, I think, to the extent that some parties believe. Whilst there were approximately 1,450 roster doctors last year, the great bulk of the medical examinations was performed by less than half this number. There were approximately 29,500 roster doctor examinations during the last fiscal year, of which it is estimated that 20 doctors did 5,000 examination, 92 doctors did 9,000 examinations, 500 doctors did 10,000 examinations and 830 doctors did the balance of 5,500 examinations. Averaging this up, 20 doctors examined 250 persons each, 92 doctors examined 98 persons each, 500 doctors examined 20 persons each and 830 doctors examined about 6 persons each during the year. Thus the bulk of the medical work was evidently performed by a comparatively small number of roster doctors.

[A. L. Jolliffe.]

I am attaching hereto a map of the British Isles marked "Attachment 'H' which has each examination centre marked thereon in red, thus indicating at a glance how well the country has been covered and showing that each district from which prospective immigrants may be developed is reasonably well served for medical examination purposes.

Unsatisfactory Places of Examination, Etc.

Considerable publicity was given to the fact that medical examinations were conducted in, I believe, about thirty centres in what was termed 'public houses.' The facts are that in these centres with the short time available to arrange accommodation it was found practically impossible to arrange permanent examination places by the time the system became operative. Arrangements were therefore made by the Health Department for accommodation in the best hotel in the locality. In a number of places the hotels chosen were recommended by the Town Clerk, or other civic officials. In other places the hotels were those listed and recommended by the Royal Automobile Club. To describe these hotels as 'public houses' was giving an altogether false impression. In each hotel the examinations were conducted in private sitting rooms and not in any public room. Within the past two months all but three of these hotel have been dispensed with and other accommodation arranged.

Some instances were referred to where medical officers had failed to reach examination centres at the advertised time and instances were reported where persons waited at centres for some considerable time for examination but, owing to the medical officer being unable to handle the number of persons present for examination, had to appear on a second occasion. In another instance it was reported that there was no waiting room available and some people waited outside in the rain.

These occurrences practically all developed when the system was just started. It was found that in a number of centres more time was required for examination than was allowed in the itinerary. On several occasions medical officers in their efforts to take care of every person appearing for examination either missed their connections or did not have time to take care of the next place of call. These instances were, of course, reported and in the second itinerary referred to later in this report provision was made to extend the examination times at such centres where this was found necessary. Some difficulties of the kind referred to were bound to occur with the inauguration of a complete new system which entailed considerable detail work to put into effect.

Increased Number of Interviews

In six out of the nine areas in the British Isles the majority of assisted passage migrants (with the exception of those coming under the Family Schemes) receive civil and medical examination at the same time and place. An estimate of the percentage of such cases so handled in the various areas is as follows:

	Per cent
Bangor area..	90
Birmingham area..	60
Bristol area..	90
Liverpool area..	50
London area..	90
York area..	90

I see no reason why joint interviews should not be successfully arranged in a considerable portion of the Glasgow area and have discussed this matter with the director in London who agrees with me in this and is giving the matter immediate attention. The procedure is not practicable in the Inverness and Belfast areas. In the Liverpool and Birmingham areas the number of joint interviews will probably increase after the system has been in operation for several months. On the criticism of the number of interviews the comment of our Liverpool agent in the fifth paragraph of his letter dated March 23rd (Attachment I) regarding the multiplicity of interviews by transportation company representatives is of interest.

This is the paragraph referred to, in the letter dated March 23rd, 1928:

All agents that I have spoken to strongly recommend that the multiplication of interviews should cease. As you know our steamship company and the Canadian National Railways send out their representatives and hold interviews at the steamship agents' offices. Under the present arrangement none of these representatives can deal finally with an application. This means that at least the applicant first interviews the local steamship agent, then the steamship company's representative, and finally myself or someone from this office, and if, as sometimes happens, he is called in to see more than one steamship company's representative he may be interviewed three, four or five times before he is finally passed, and this does not include his medical examination.

The Obtaining of Photographs a Hardship

There are no doubt certain isolated districts where some difficulty may be experienced in getting to a photographer. The regulations call for a full face photograph not larger than $2\frac{1}{4} \times 1\frac{3}{4}$. In some instances snapshots have been accepted. I think it should be generally understood that snapshots will be accepted provided the same are sufficiently clear as to furnish positive means of identification.

British Migrants Prefer Roster Doctors

I have no information on this point. Under the old system immigrants were examined by medical officers at the port of entry who were strangers and I have never heard of any objection being raised on this account.

Medical Inspection of Passengers Paying Full Fare

Several instances were mentioned regarding full fare passengers deciding not to proceed to Canada on account of having to undergo medical examination in the British Isles. Of the cases followed up not one was found where Canada had lost an immigrant due to medical inspection. In one case the inquiries have not been completed. Migrants paying full fare do not require, unless they wish, to pass medical inspection at medical centres. They can be examined at port of embarkation prior to sailing.

Appended hereto and marked 'Attachment J' are letters received by Departmental officials from two gentlemen who together with their families were medically examined under the present system. In one letter the following statement is made:

After all the adverse criticism one sees in the press on the subject of the examination we feel it only right to express to you and through you to your agents and the medical officer our grateful thanks for the extreme courtesy and consideration we received from these officers.

We really fail to understand how anyone can adversely criticize either arrangement or treatment received.

In the other the following appears:

I shall take every opportunity of refuting the rather hysterical articles in some newspapers concerning the new medical regulations on this side—which are erroneous and misleading.

The comment by these parties is illuminating not only with regard to the satisfaction expressed relative to the medical inspection but also with regard to the comment on the adverse publicity in the press.

Speaking generally, the difficulties referred to are, in my opinion, to a large extent anticipations rather than realities.

Immediately the new system of medical inspection became operative, a careful check was kept of the examinations at the various centres with a view of establishing what changes would be necessary in the itinerary, such as changing of medical centres, insufficient area, too much time allowed at different centres decreasing or increasing the number of centres, etc. As has been stated in this report, some minor difficulties developed and it became evident that some additional centres would have to be created, also additional time was needed in several important centres. The conclusion was reached that local doctors should be appointed to handle immigrants in outlying districts such as the west section of Cornwall, Channel Islands, parts of Merionethshire, Cardiganshire and Pembrokeshire in England and Wales; Oban, Campbelltown and the outlying islands of Argyllshire, Rothsay and Whiting Bay, Buteshire, Shetlands, Orkneys, Hebrides, north and west sections of Invernesshire, Sunderlandshire, etc., in Scotland.

A new itinerary was prepared to become effective from April 1st, 1928, which provided for an additional twenty or so examining centres, increased the hours for examination at a large number of centres and changed the hours at others. For example, at Newcastle an additional day and a half has been allowed each month. At Birmingham and Dundee the time has been doubled. At Manchester the time has been increased from half a day to a full day. A printed copy of the itinerary is attached to this report and marked "Attachment K."

In order to cover the additional requirements under the new itinerary, five additional medical inspectors have been appointed; thus there are now 23 medical officers of the Department of Health handling medical inspection in addition to 28 local doctors handling the outlying districts referred to above.

I found after a careful enquiry at each agency that applications are being handled promptly. Appended hereto and marked "Attachment L" is a statement showing the number of applications received at each agency between December 15th, 1927, and February 29th, 1928, indicating the disposition of the applications on the last mentioned date.

ASSISTED PASSAGE APPLICATIONS HANDLED BETWEEN DECEMBER 15, 1927
AND FEBRUARY 29, 1928

	Number received	Number accepted	Number civil	Refused medical	Number withdrawn	Failed to appear for examination	Not complete at Feb. 29
Bangor.....	495	204	28	44	24	88	111
York.....	1,303	519	249	53	82	150	250
London.....	713	222	153	35	125	90	93
Glasgow.....	1,392	431	361	9	40	174	377
Liverpool.....	1,256	408	202	78	146	151	271
Inverness.....	640	180	93	5	59	255	48
Birmingham.....	159	102	9		10	23	15
Belfast.....	2,567	677	320	65	455	262	788
Bristol.....	291	119			35	53	(Figures not complete)
	8,816	2,862	1,415	289	976	1,246	1,953

It will be observed that from a total of 8,816, 33 per cent have been accepted, 20 per cent rejected on civil and medical grounds, 11 per cent withdrawn, 14 per cent failed to attend for examination and 22 per cent were not yet complete. During March a considerable proportion of those outstanding were approved.

Referring particularly to the percentage of applications where the applicants did not appear for examination, one of our Agents stated that a considerable number of the applications filed had been signed by persons who had no intention of proceeding to Canada. Whether the percentage of valueless applications is greater or less this year than last I have been unable to ascertain definitely. It will be interesting to note, however, that in the Glasgow area where comparative figures were available the number of applicants who did not proceed further after signing applications was 466 up to February 28th, 1927, as against 214 for the same period in 1928. In the Birmingham area our Agent estimated that the number of applicants who did not appear for examination this year was approximately 5 per cent greater than last year.

The general opinion of our officers in the British Isles is that the medical inspection is not adversely affecting immigration and that whilst in some districts the old roster doctor system was more convenient, yet considering the saving of money and taking the country as a whole, the scheme is working satisfactorily. The officer in charge of the Glasgow area was the only Agent who expressed a preference for the roster doctor system. Joint civil interviews and medical examinations were not in operation in this district and some minor difficulties in a few individual cases had, I think, assumed undue importance in the eyes of the officer in question. The working of this area was discussed very thoroughly with the Director in London who informed me that he would give particular attention to the areas so that the same would be in line with the other sections of the country.

Our Agents had no record of assisted passage applicants refusing to proceed with their applications on account of medical inspection. Our officers reported one or two cases where difficulty had arisen in connection with immigrants paying full fare. The cause in practically every case was evidently due to misunderstanding of the requirements and upon an explanation being furnished, the cases were satisfactorily concluded.

Insofar as domestics are concerned, officers of the Women's Branch in the various areas all stated they had received no complaints regarding

medical inspection, that applicants were coming forward for medical examination without hesitation and that in the majority of cases applicants save money, they not now having to pay the 10/6 medical fee as formerly. These officers look upon the present system as a forward step which assists them in their work. From January 1st to March 15th, 1928, there is recorded an increase of 53 domestic applications approved over the corresponding period for 1927.

As I believe the Department has not received copies of circulars issued by the North Atlantic Passenger Conference with regard to medical inspection, these have been obtained and are attached to this report marked "attachment M."

After a careful survey of the whole situation in the British Isles, I find that the present system of medical inspection is working well and I failed to discover evidence that the procedure now in effect is acting as a deterrent to immigration. An examination of the figures covering medical examination in the British Isles, which appear in Attachment "G" referred to earlier in this report, would indicate that the present system of medical inspection is more effective than the previous system. A reference to the figures covering the number of certifications will show that during the month of February, 1928, there was a very considerable increase in the number of certifications for mental causes as against the same period in 1927, and the same remark applies with regard to physical defects.

The change from the roster doctor to the present system of medical examination was effected with a minimum of difficulty. Adjustments, some of which are referred to earlier in this report, were found necessary and no doubt as time goes on the medical itineraries and accommodation will be further adjusted and improved as the result of experience and the needs of the various districts. The officers of this Department are co-operating with the medical officers and I feel sure that with the experience gained from month to month the co-operative effort will become closer and increasingly effective. The officers of both services are taking all reasonable steps to avoid delay to cases and to assist intending immigrants to comply with the regulations without inconvenience. I should judge after an examination of numbers of average cases in the various agencies that in more than 50 per cent of the cases the fact of there being no fee to pay for medical examination has resulted in an actual saving of money to the prospective migrants and that the number of cases where more actual inconvenience is caused to attend an examination centre as against calling upon a roster doctor is a comparatively small percentage when set against the total number of cases which derive a benefit from the existing system.

The Continent

I visited our offices at Danzig, Hamburg, Rotterdam, Antwerp and Paris, at which points medical inspection takes place for Continental immigrants. Practically all immigrants arrive at the ports from one to three days prior to sailing date the same as heretofore; the civil and medical examinations proceed simultaneously. In order to cover sailings from Bremen, the civil and medical inspectors stationed at Hamburg proceed to that port prior to sailings to conduct the necessary examinations. There is not sufficient immigration to Canada from Bremen to warrant the appointment of officers for assignment at that port.

The only difficulty experienced arose at one of the Continental ports in connection with some minor certification by the medical officer.

The matter was adjusted by the Chief Medical Officer in London as soon as the same came to his attention.

As the number of immigrants embarking at Riga is very small, I did not visit that port.

From my observations and inquiries I am convinced that the medical inspection at Continental ports is proceeding satisfactorily without delays or difficulty.

(Signed) A. L. JOLIFFE,
Commissioner.

Since the completion of this report figures for the month of March, 1928, covering assisted passage migration to Australia have been received. These establish that for the three months ending March 31, 1928, 6,310 persons migrated as against 8,100 for the same period in 1927, or a decrease of 22 per cent. It will be observed from figures already given in this report that the decrease in assisted passage migration to Canada for the period mentioned is 16.7 per cent as against 22 per cent for Australia.

That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Mr. Joliffe, reference has been made to the forms of questions asked and answered, and so on; I suppose you have, or your Department has, all these forms which are used, the questionnaires?—A. Yes.

Q. Those used for assisted passage, those used for unassisted passage, and for domestics and boys; they probably would vary somewhat, would they not?—A. Yes.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I think, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that it would be advisable to have these forms in use in the Old Country, in the Mother Country, those that are in use on the Continent of Europe, and in use in the United States incorporated in the record; I would like to see them there, myself.

WITNESS: In the United States?

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Yes. Do you not use forms there?—A. No.

Q. There are no questionnaires there at all?—A. No.

Q. You have them for the classes I have mentioned, assisted and unassisted, from the Old Country; there are no assisted passages from the Continent. But you have the forms used over there?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you the forms also used by Australia and New Zealand?—A. I could not really answer that question, Dr. Edwards; I do not know whether we have or not. The only forms they should fill out are assisted passage migrants.

Q. That is, those who are talking about going to Australia?—A. No, to Canada. That is the form for assisted passage migrants; the other is an introductory form which is filled out by every passenger coming to Canada, for the purpose of completing the steamship manifest, as required by the Canadian law.

Q. What I want to get at is a list of the questions put to migrants, whether assisted passages or not; the questions they are required to answer, the medical examination, the civil examination, and so on, for domestics and boys, the assisted passages and the unassisted passages.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: And if he has anything to compare them with, they can be compared.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I think it will be instructive to make a comparison with the forms and questionnaires we use as against those in use in Australia and New Zealand.

[A. L. Joliffe.]

Mr. LUCAS: I am under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that some of these forms were printed at the beginning of this inquiry, but that can be ascertained.

By Mr. McPhee:

Q. Mr. Joliffe, you quoted a number of cases cited by the transportation companies. Did you write and ask them to submit all their difficulties to you, or how did you come to get your information?—A. I asked each transportation official I interviewed if he had had any difficulties, what they were, and what evidence he could furnish me in support of his statement. These are all the documents I have received.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. In connection with Dr. Edwards' question, have you also the forms that would have to be filled out by Canadians returning to Canada?—A. Yes. I think we can file a copy of that form. You mean, the declaration form?

Q. Whatever it is; I do not know what it is, but whatever is required?—A. We can file, I think, a copy of that.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. In regard to photographs, there was some mention made of the inconvenience which was caused by the regulations requiring a certain photograph taken by a regular photographer. Is it not a fact that at the present time the Canadian Pacific Railway, for instance, have supplied their representatives in the Old Country with quick development kodaks, to take photographs, and that they are being accepted?—A. I do not know about the Canadian Pacific Railway furnishing their men with kodaks; I have not heard that, but I have heard that several booking agents have taken photographs for passengers. Snapshot photographs have been accepted. No cards have been refused on the ground that the man had a snapshot photograph.

Q. I was told that by a C.P.R. official?—A. That may be, I do not know.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: It does not occur to me that a snapshot should not be accepted.

Mr. GLEN: Not if it is a clear snapshot.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Mr. Joliffe, you are in touch with the London office, which is the headquarters, I presume, overseas of your service?—A. Yes.

Q. I presume most of the centres report to your London office?—A. Yes.

Q. The regulations issued from the London office, did you have an opportunity of going over them while you were there?—A. Yes.

Q. Were any instructions given to agents throughout the country that only professional photographs should be obtained and that a snapshot would not be accepted?—A. No. The instructions issued were that the photograph had to be a full-face photograph of a certain size.

Q. We had the evidence of Colonel Culshaw, of the Salvation Army, the other day; he said that photographs were refused unless made by a professional photographer?—A. I was not here when that evidence was given. I have seen a number of snapshots on the certificates. So far as I am aware, there have been none refused. I have seen none refused, and I have seen snapshot photographs accepted.

Q. Would you say definitely that there were no instructions from the Department to your agents that only a professional photograph would be accepted?—A. Not that I am aware of.

Q. You would be aware of it if such instructions had been issued?—A. Yes.

[A. L. Joliffe.]

Q. It would come within your department?—A. Yes.

Q. So far as you are concerned, you do not know of any?—A. No. I have seen none.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. You cited one case of an arithmetic test being put to a migrant?—A. Yes.

Q. Is the agent in each case allowed to use his own judgment as to what kind of mental test he will put an intending migrant to, or do you give him any outline or any instructions about what line he is to take?—A. I cannot answer that question authoritatively, Dr. Edwards. That would be for the Department of Health. It would be for the Department of Health to answer that. The medical officer is the man who examines the migrant. I do not know what kind of mental test he gives.

Q. I have had it told to me that in some cases migrants are asked such fool questions as are frequently asked in the civil service examinations, for instance, "Is Alberta a province or a city?" or "Is Canada ruled by the King, or is it a Republic?" I do not see how such tests as these will determine whether or not a person is fit to become a citizen of Canada.

Mr. DONNELLY: That was the case of a party who was not mentally fit, as he thought. The statement is that although the woman was over thirty years of age she had the mental capacity of a child of twelve.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I was wondering whether the person examining applied the appropriate test. I would not at all be particular, if a woman is a good servant and a good cook, whether she can pass an examination in arithmetic or not.

Mr. DONNELLY: But perhaps she might not know the difference between two and a dozen eggs, when stated in a receipt.

The WITNESS: In that case there was also a physical trouble as well. The person had double heart disease.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I noticed that, but she was turned down for the other reason, that she could not do a simple sum in arithmetic. When you read the medical examination it showed good ground for turning her down, and that that was the real reason.

The WITNESS: Yes, that was it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Any further questions from this witness?

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. Mr. Joliffe, have you any idea of the number of Continentals that are turned back at the port of embarkation? I believe the Continentals all come to the port of embarkation for examination.—A. Yes, they are examined at the Continental port of embarkation.

Q. Have you any figures to show the percentage of those that are turned back?—A. I have not that available at the moment, Mr. Lucas. We could obtain it.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. I know I am going over what you have already given in detail, but could you, without your notes, give us a summary of what, in your opinion, are the advantages of the present system and what are the disadvantages, so that the Committee may have from you a first hand view of the situation over there? I think it will be easier to follow you without your notes. There are some advantages which you have mentioned and I think you have quite frequently said there were some disadvantages. Can you give those to us?—A. Yes, I think so, sir. The advantages as I see them are these: First from the point of view of the migrant. Under the present system when a migrant is examined, he knows

either that he is admissible to Canada or that he is not. Under the old system, when he came to the Canadian port and was rejected, it was a very serious hardship for that migrant and his family.

Secondly, the inspection by Canadian officers overseas, from these figures, would in my opinion indicate that we are eliminating misfits and mental defectives much more efficiently than we were under the old system. Those, I think, are the two important points.

So far as the disadvantages are concerned, I do not see that there are any very serious disadvantages. It is true there may be the occasional case where it may be somewhat of a hardship for a person to appear for medical inspection, but it seems to me that when any person is deciding to go to Canada, it is a big move in his life and he should have no hesitation about putting himself to some little inconvenience in order to come to a country where he expects to make good, and to make a better living. I see no real disadvantages. There have been little difficulties, as I have endeavoured to show in my report, when this system started, but when one comes to consider that there is a complete change and a laying out of an itinerary over three or four countries, with really no sure statistics on which to base your plans, it seems to me that the change has been effected in a wonderfully smooth manner and that there has been very little trouble.

Q. We had evidence from people the other day pointing out this—I do not know that it is a disadvantage of the system—but it was said that even your first point was not absolutely met because even though the Canadian doctor passed the man at the point of inspection, the Board of Trade doctor might still inspect him. In other words, the man was not yet certain that he was going to get to Canada even though he was passed by a Canadian doctor. I was speaking about the British Board of Trade doctors first, and dealing with that first, is there any way you can suggest whereby there might be some closer method of co-operation between the Board of Trade doctor and the Canadian doctors so that that possibility might be eliminated?—A. I have not considered that, sir; but, in the first place, so far as I am aware, there are very, very few cases and only cases such as, I think Doctor Clarke mentioned yesterday in his evidence, where a man might develop diphtheria or measles or some other infectious disease. Now, it is to the advantage of the man himself that he should not be allowed to come forward until that condition is cleared up. It simply means that he is put back until he is in good health again and then he comes forward, which would happen under any conditions at any place.

Q. Have you known or heard of any cases in which a man was passed by the Canadian doctor and rejected by the Board of Trade doctors, notwithstanding that he was in the same condition on his second examination as he was in his first?—A. No, sir. There were two or three cases referred to in that evidence, of boys, and the explanation was that one boy had developed an abscess in the neck and another boy had a high temperature. Those are the only cases that I ran into in my investigation.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. That would be some infectious disease?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. What about the case of sarcoma? There was something the matter which might happen to be a case of sarcoma?—A. Yes.

MR. EGAN: I understand that the Board of Trade doctor has really nothing whatever to do with the emigrant. In this case of the boy with the abscess, it was the ship company's doctor who would not accept him on the ship. The Board of Trade doctor is only for the Department of Health in the Old Country.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: I understand that is all from this witness.

Witness retired.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: A telegram has been received by Mr. Fraser, our secretary, from Mr. Coldwell, which is as follows:—

As principal of City High School with annual examinations approaching, almost impossible for me to leave Regina. My entire source of information was Minister of Immigration. That information indicated that departmental records would support information given me. Prepared to send affidavit outlining in detail all circumstances surrounding the seat of information. Kindly reply immediately if this course would be satisfactory or not.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Will you read that again, please. I did not hear you distinctly.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: This telegram was sent in response to one sent by the Secretary of the Committee yesterday. It is addressed to Mr. Fraser, the Clerk of the Committee. I am punctuating it for myself; there is no punctuation in it.

(The telegram referred to was again read and a discussion followed as to calling Mr. Coldwell to give evidence.)

It was moved by Mr. Bancroft, seconded by Mr. Glen, that Mr. Coldwell be notified that his proposition to send an affidavit is not acceptable to this Committee, and that he hold himself in readiness to respond to a summons to attend when required.

The motion was declared carried.

The Committee adjourned until Monday, May 14, at 11 a.m., to proceed with the consideration of wheat grading.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, May 15, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

M. J. COLDWELL called and sworn.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coldwell, what have you to say to the Committee?

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to know exactly what you wish me to do. Do you wish me to give a statement or how do you wish me to proceed? This is the first time I have appeared before a committee of this nature and I would like to be informed as to the proper procedure.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the wish of the Committee?

Discussion followed and the Clerk as directed read an article from The Leader, Regina, November 24, 1927, as follows:

TRAFFIC IN IMMIGRATION PERMITS BY MEMBERS OF FEDERAL HOUSE ALLEGED

HE NEVER OBTAINED PROOF OF THIS WHILE AT OTTAWA, SAYS MILTON
CAMPBELL, M.P., IN REPLYING TO COLDWELL'S CHARGES

The allegation was made by Alderman M. J. Coldwell, at a meeting last night under the auspices of the Sons of England to discuss immigration, that at a time when the officials had put up the bars on immigration prior to the agreement with the railways of March 16, 1927, "a regular traffic was carried on at Ottawa of the sale of permits to admit men who were not ordinarily eligible for entry into Canada. "These permits," he declared, "were sold by members of parliament in Canada for the sum of \$100 each. That went on for several years. I am not stating what I does not know to be an absolute fact. It is not hearsay, it is not guesswork. I got that possibly from the highest source in Canada on immigration affairs. These permits were sold, and the bars were let down and people were allowed to flow in who were not ordinarily eligible for our immigration."

SURRENDER TO RAIL FIRMS

Proceeding, the alderman said, "this should be said for the present minister of immigration that, aware of this particular fact, it was thought advisable to have a straight agreement with the railways rather than get around this immigration policy in this particular way, so on March 16, 1927, this new agreement was signed which gave the railways a free hand to bring in all the agricultural workers they could obtain from the southern European parts." A railway dumping policy, he asserted, seemed to be the policy of the department at present. Before this agreement, he said, the officials were a little too careful for the railways, but this new agreement represented a surrender on the part of the Department of Immigration to the railway companies. Moreover, in his opinion, it represented a let-down for those officials who had been working to keep the bars where they should have been.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

SHOULD CONSIDER OWN PEOPLE

"Any policy we have along the lines of Immigration," he continued, "should be a policy first of all based on the best interests of our own people. After all, we have lived here, and we are interested in obtaining for ourselves and our children and those who come here the very best conditions we can find. We are not interested in providing for the exploitation of our natural resources a great deal of cheap labour brought in from any country in the world. Our policy should first be based on the prosperity, the economic and social welfare of our own citizens. And, if we want to settle our vacant lands, why not consider the re-settlement of a large number of people in our own midst who are eminently suitable for that kind of work." The latter class he mentioned as those who through rust, hail, other damage to crops and mortgage companies had gone to the wall. There should not be a policy which flooded the country with a large amount of cheap labour, for that depressed the standard of living.

NO DEFINITE PROOF, HE SAYS

Milton Campbell, M.P. for Mackenzie, who was present at the meeting and was called upon to speak, humorously remarked he began to tremble when the speaker who had preceded him started to talk about members and the \$100, and wondered how much he had missed, for he had assisted in bringing a good many people to Canada. "We heard these rumors at Ottawa, but as close as I was to Ottawa I was not able to get any definite proof," he went on. "I know one man not a member of Parliament an official, was suddenly transferred to some other part of the world. There was no dismissal, although there was no doubt he was making money through bringing in people of a certain race. I think the man is still in the employment of the department or some other department, but he is away in some other part of the earth."

Mr. Campbell said he agreed to a very large extent with what Alderman Coldwell had said in regard to immigration policy, and the department of immigration delegating its authority to the railway companies. He thought that all propaganda or agitation in outside countries should be stopped, but he would let it be known throughout the world that Canada would welcome immigrants of the right class. If the money which was now spent on propaganda was spent to assist immigrants after they arrived in Canada, he thought the final results would be better than they are now.

KNOWS DEPARTMENT RECORDS

When Mr. Campbell had finished his remarks, Alderman Coldwell took the opportunity to say something further about the selling of permits. The member for Mackenzie had said something as to definite proof of the selling of permits. "I know who have sold them," declared Alderman Coldwell, "I know at least some of the members of Parliament who have sold them, and I know what the records of the department were under both Hon. Mr. Stewart and his successor. Definitely, I know the names of some members who sold these permits." After a pause, and amid laughter, Alderman Coldwell added, "I should say Mr. Campbell was not one of these members."

George Edwards, of the United Farmers of Canada, Saskatchewan section, said he thought the immigration policy had been mistaken in that it had been assumed that the main consideration was to coax people to come to this country. His impression was that if more attention had been devoted to solving economic problems still pressing for solution they would not need any immigration policy at all.

The proceedings were presided over by C. Bennett.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee; I think the reason has been pretty well outlined as to why I am here this morning. I may say I have not a written statement. As you will see from the telegram I received on Friday my notice to leave was somewhat short, and while I was advised by a gentleman that perhaps I might wait until I got my transportation sent to me, nevertheless, I felt that the Committee desired to hear me this morning and I was quite prepared to come along. Therefore, I must ask your indulgence because I will not have a written statement. The statement I will make will be verbal, from a few notes.

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the newspaper article which was read to you is substantially correct; it does substantially state what I said. It perhaps is written up in journalistic fashion under a startling heading, and that heading makes the statement that I made charges. If you will notice in the course of that newspaper article, no charges were made—

Mr. SPENCE: They certainly were made.

The WITNESS: —but I did say that I had the information which I was using from the highest authority on immigration in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. CAHAN: You said you knew the names of the members.

Hon. Dr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Who was the highest authority?

The WITNESS: If you do not mind, I would like to make my statement. I think I will bring that point out.

I may say in this connection also that the meeting which I was addressing was one that was called by the Sons of England, who, in common with other organizations in the city of Regina and in the western part of this country at least, were very critical of the "letting down of the bars" as we term them, in connection with our immigration policy. I myself, as you will see from the article, was critical of that. The newspaper report is, of course, a partial report of what I said. In the same address I pleaded for the bringing into the country of a large number of boys who are leaving schools in Great Britain and who cannot be absorbed into the industries of that country, believing that in that way we would be able to build up our country. I did, however, as you will see from the report, state that in my opinion the reason for letting down these bars to some extent was on account of the difficulty the present Minister of Immigration had in controlling the matter of the issuance of permits. I also gave it as my opinion that the Minister of Immigration should be given some credit for having done that. I want to make that perfectly clear right at the outset.

Now, last week I noticed an article in the *Regina Post* dated at Ottawa, May 10th, and I noticed that this matter had been before this Committee, that Mr. Forke had stated he had a conversation with Alderman Coldwell in which he had mentioned to the Alderman current gossip and suspicions in respect to the use of these permits; "current gossip" being in quotation marks.

May I say a word or two with regard to that, because it has a direct bearing on the newspaper article. I was prepared to accept the word of a Minister of the Crown as to the conditions which had existed. I came to Ottawa on March 15 of last year, and I saw Mr. Forke. I may say that on that day I had luncheon in the restaurant of the House of Commons, and I saw Mr. Forke in the dining room and went across and spoke to him, because there was a matter which I did wish to discuss with him. I will tell you what that matter was, because it brought up the whole conversation. Early in January, 1927, a man whom I knew in the city of Regina came to me and told me that he was making a little visit to Ottawa; that he knew some of the Ministers at Ottawa, but did not know Mr. Forke, but having followed his career he would like to meet him. He asked me if I would give him a line of introduction to

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

Mr. Forke. I wrote him a letter to the effect that the bearer of the letter was paying a visit to Ottawa where he was desirous of meeting some of the Ministers and that if Mr. Forke could afford him the opportunity of an interview, he would appreciate it. He came to Ottawa and I met him some few weeks later—in February, 1927—and I asked him if he had been to Ottawa and he told me yes, he had. I asked him if he had seen Mr. Forke and he told me yes, he had, but that he could do nothing with him. I asked him what that statement meant and he told me that he was down for a bunch of immigration permits which meant a great deal to some of the boys. Now, gentlemen of the Committee, I can assure you of this, that no letter of mine to the Minister was intended to have been used for the purpose of securing permits. I felt very keenly about it; it worried me a great deal. It so happened that a few days later it was intimated that I had been appointed as one of the three delegates from Saskatchewan to the National Committee for the celebration of the Diamond Jubilee of Canada, and, therefore, knowing that I was coming to Ottawa, I decided to straighten this matter out with Mr. Forke. The discussion of this question arose out of my going to Mr. Forke's office and mentioning this particular incident, which Mr. Forke recollected. In that connection Mr. Forke explained to me why he did not sign those permits. The conversation, may I say, was not confidential; it was a conversation dealing with a matter in which I regarded myself as being very vitally interested, a matter indeed, Mr. Chairman, in connection with which I felt that my own honour and reputation was more or less at stake. As I say, I saw Mr. Forke and he told me why these had not been signed—

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Let me interrupt right here to say that I, at least, as a member of this Committee, reserve to myself the right to decide whether this conversation was confidential, personal or not.

The WITNESS: Yes sir. But I think I have the right to make that statement.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I have now my own conception of the matter, that it was a personal letter by you introducing a friend, and you are now trying to explain a matter of personal honour.

The WITNESS: This conversation arose in that way. Mr. Forke told me he had done his level best to stop the issuance of these permits; he further told me they had been abused. I believed him. He said that large numbers of them had been issued previously and that the records of the Department would bear that out or deny it. He gave me an incident which led me to believe that such was the case.

Mr. CAHAN: State the incident.

The WITNESS: State the incident, sir?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes.

The WITNESS: He told me that soon after he became Minister of Immigration a man whom I understood to be a defeated member of the House came to Mr. Forke with a bunch of permits to be signed. Mr. Forke said—I remember his words distinctly—that such a request aroused his Scotch temper and he refused. On another occasion Mr. Forke mentioned to me a member who had received a large number of these permits and, as in the former instance,—oh, perhaps I should say this, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Forke in the conversation previously, as I have to state that incident, had said that when his Scotch temper was aroused he asked this man what these permits were worth to him, and the man told him they were worth \$100 each and he had his election expenses to pay.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Who was the man? Did he mention the name?—A. He may have mentioned the name, but I did not catch the name, sir. In the second instance he spoke of a man who had a large number, or who had obtained a large number of permits, and who had disposed of them in that way.

Q. Did he mention the name?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you please give it?—A. Is this an occasion upon which I can do that? I am quite willing to give the name, sir, but I would like to know my position as to my privilege here. I am repeating a statement made to me by the Minister and I do not wish to give that name in view of the fact that Mr. Forke stated last week that he was repeating to me gossip and suspicion.

Mr. CAHAN: I move that in order that the witness may have every defence by way of privilege that the Committee request him to give the name. Under these circumstances I think he will be privileged.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I want to suggest that the witness was not particularly careful about privilege when he made the statement in Regina with regard to Members of Parliament without designating them, and as it seems to me cast a slur on every person concerned and I do not see why any special privilege should be accorded the witness now. He is here to answer questions; if he is entitled to privilege, he will get it; if he is not, he won't; that is all.

Mr. CAHAN: I submit that a witness appearing by summons before this Committee, if he asks that privilege be accorded to him, is entitled to be accorded that privilege by a vote of the Committee requiring him to state the facts. I move he be requested to state the facts.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Cahan has asked a question and it seems to me it is up to the witness, and this Committee should not accord him any special privilege; that he should take care of himself as he has taken care of himself on the platform. If he is entitled to privilege he gets it; if not, I for one think he should not have it.

Mr. LUCAS: I do not think the witness is asking for any special privilege whatever.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: That is right. Then we can go on.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): May I ask some of the legal fraternity what they mean by "privilege"?

Mr. CAHAN: A witness appearing before this Committee is protected in the courts with regard to the statements he makes to the Committee as against libel and slander, if he makes a reply to a question by order of the Committee. We are here to elicit the truth, and, therefore, we should give the order that he answer this particular question and be accorded such privilege as he is afforded with respect to a statement here as would be accorded him by a court in the event of an action for slander or libel.

Mr. GLEN: Mr. Chairman, if the witness makes a statement which is a slander or a libel upon any member of this Committee or any Member of Parliament, Mr. Cahan is moving that he be protected in that statement. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if the witness is prepared to make a statement which he can also repeat outside but which would make him then a subject for slander or libel, he is not entitled to make it in this Committee and have the publicity spread all over the Dominion, and then get the special privilege that he is not responsible for that statement. I suggest if he makes a statement, let him make it upon his own responsibility.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, just one word. Let us get down to the basis of this. In view of the statements which have been made and published in the press, it is the duty and responsibility of this Committee to probe those to the bottom, and I will not be a party to any attempt to restrain this witness from

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

giving evidence with regard to these material facts. He is here by order of this Committee; he has said that Members of the House of Commons—if I remember it correctly—were mentioned to him by Mr. Forke, and I ask that the names of those Members be given now to the Committee, in order that this probe may be facilitated.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: No one is objecting to that.

Mr. GLEN: I am not objecting to the witness giving the name of every Member whom he knows. As stated in the papers he definitely knows the names, and I am not objecting to his giving them, but I am objecting that he should be given a special privilege to name somebody and then seek the cover of this Committee in not standing up to any action that might be taken against him.

Mr. CAHAN: He is asked to give the name that a Minister of the Crown gave to him. He does not know the truth or falsity of it.

Mr. MCGIBBON: We have summoned this man here to produce proof of his charges. He has made statements which I think are serious and which reflect upon us all. It is only fair to him to let him present his case. If he has sufficient proof upon which he was justified in making that statement, then probably one can excuse him; if he has not, I certainly for one will hold him guilty.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I support Mr. Cahan's contention, being influenced by his logic, and I would like to add that after all in extending the privilege to the witness we are only giving him for the time being a privilege which we all enjoy as Members of Parliament as saying things in the House we would not dare to say outside.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I am still of the opinion that the Committee should not extend any special privileges—

Mr. CAHAN: We are not extending any privileges; we are ordering him to answer.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I am concurring absolutely in Mr. Cahan's statement with regard to giving the name. No one is attempting to shut the name out, but Mr. Coldwell has made a statement with regard to Members of Parliament generally without any privilege or without asking any, and I do not know why he cannot make his statement with regard to any particular individual in the same way. (To the witness) You are not taking the position that you require an order before you answer?

The WITNESS: No, but I am taking this position, that I wish to have the same privilege extended to me as is accorded to Members of Parliament.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. I am in accord with what Mr. Cahan has said up to a certain point. But if the witness wants to seek immunity from prosecution for any statement he may make here, because he is making it to a parliamentary Committee, then Mr. Cahan's—

Mr. CAHAN: The distinction is between making a voluntary statement and answering a specific question proposed to him by this Committee. I think the will of this Committee should be made known that he answer this specific question. He is not making any charge against any Member; he is saying that a Minister of the Crown, the head of a Department, gave him the name of a Member of Parliament who is trafficking in permits, and for the purpose of facilitating this inquiry this Committee should demand to know who that person is, what his name is, in order that we may ascertain the real truth.

Mr. GLEN: Mr. Cahan is interjecting into this another issue that is not before the Committee. I am satisfied that not a single member of this Committee objects to the witness giving the name. We are not objecting to

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

his giving his statement in its entirety, but we are objecting that this witness should have a special privilege in giving evidence before this Committee. He has a statement to make, let him make it on his own responsibility. He has made it outside, why can he not make it before the Committee?

Mr. CAHAN: I am not affording him nor suggesting affording him any special privilege but he should have, as a witness before this Committee, all the privileges which appertain to him as a witness giving the evidence he is compelled to give. That is all.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: He has been summoned and compelled to come. He is not here voluntarily. He has been sworn and is a witness before this Committee—not voluntarily. It seems to me he has whatever privilege attains to that position. Everyone seems perfectly willing to have him answer the question.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (*Frontenac*): I was going to suggest an easy way out of the difficulty. He has the right to name the Minister. No chance of any lawsuit there, privilege or no privilege. Then the Minister he mentions is privileged as a Member of Parliament, and he can get up and give us the name. Instead of the witness giving us the name of the member, he can give the name of the Minister, and he would not run the risk of any lawsuit outside, then the Minister can give the name of the Member and he is protected as a Member of Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: I may say that I do not think this Committee can give any special privilege to any witness. Whatever privileges are granted to him by Parliament he has. This Committee can neither take away nor give him any more, but the witness is obliged to answer any proper question put to him by the Committee.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: The Chairman has ruled that the witness is bound to answer any proper questions.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Does that mean that when a witness is summoned and does not wish to mention the name of any particular man he is bound to do so on a question by some member of this Committee and does not receive any special protection?

The CHAIRMAN: I am quite sure any rights—

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Has the witness not any right to make his own statement?

The CHAIRMAN: The witness is obliged to answer any proper question put to him.

Mr. VALLANCE: I think the witness said he did not treat his conversation with the Minister as confidential. If he did not, then he should be able to give that conversation to this Committee. That part is no more confidential than what has already been given.

The CHAIRMAN: I might add that the witness is obliged to answer any question which the Committee as a Committee put to him. It does not necessarily mean that he must answer any question proposed by a single member of the Committee, but if the Committee as a Committee decides that a question put by a single member shall be answered, it shall be answered. I can see no object in Mr. Cahan's motion because this Committee cannot add to nor take away from any rights of the witness.

Mr. CAHAN: Your ruling is perfectly correct. All I wish is that the will of the Committee may be made known by means of the resolution which I moved. Whatever may flow from that this witness is entitled to, and, therefore, I press my motion being put, in order to express the will of this Committee that this question should be answered by this Committee.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Question.

The CHAIRMAN: I will ask Mr. Coldwell if he objects to answering the question.

Mr. SPENCE: There is a motion before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. I will ask Mr. Coldwell if he objects to answering this question. If not, there is no necessity for a ruling.

The WITNESS: The only objection I have to answering that question is this, that Mr. Forke now states that he was giving me current gossip and suspicions.

Mr. CAHAN: That is no defence—what he subsequently said. You are bound to answer the question. This Committee has expressed its will through the Chairman that you answer it.

The WITNESS: If I understand that the Committee requires me to answer that question, I will answer it.

Mr. BROWN: It seems to me there is a little confusion in Mr. Cahan's position. Are we to decide whether we shall accord this witness privilege, or are we to decide whether this particular question shall be answered?

The CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled that the Committee cannot extend a privilege, that already exists by rule.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Cahan's motion is that this particular question be answered?

Mr. CAHAN: That is all.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: And the Chairman has ruled that he answer it.

The CHAIRMAN: My ruling is that the question is a proper one and should be answered. Is it the wish of the Committee to appeal from that ruling?

The WITNESS: I will answer the question. The name mentioned to me was that of Mr. McMurray of Winnipeg.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. Was he a member of Parliament at the time this conversation took place?—A. I said that prior to Mr. Forke's ministry—

Q. What was the date of that meeting?—A. March 1927.

Q. Mr. McMurray was not a member of Parliament then?—A. Not at that time, but I said prior to that time. Now, in further reference to that statement: I also notice that Mr. Forke last week stated—

Mr. CAHAN: Please give your own evidence.

The WITNESS: May I just say this?

Mr. CAHAN: You are not giving your evidence with regard to any statements made by Mr. Forke last week; you are giving your evidence of statements alleged to have been made by Mr. Forke to you. Please confine your evidence to that.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: A statement made by you at Regina.

The WITNESS: I will try to do that, sir. As soon as the press report appeared—or at least within two days, I had to go away on a law case in connection with a teacher's matter. When I returned home I wrote to Mr. Forke—

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Was that after this publication in the paper?—A. Yes.

Q. We are asking you to give evidence, and you began to give evidence, with regard to your conversation with Mr. Forke, as a basis for your statement. We are not asking you to deal with subsequent correspondence with Mr. Forke. That may become relevant later on, but now tell us the whole subject of your

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

conversation with Mr. Forke.—A. I must plead ignorance of the proper procedure before a committee of this nature.

The CHAIRMAN: Anything which appeared in the press with reference to Mr. Forke or what he said before this committee should not be quoted by you, unless it is of record in our minutes of evidence. It is purely a press despatch. Anything you may have seen in the papers is not official.

The WITNESS: There is one other point which I might also mention in this connection, since the statement is under discussion. Briefly it is this: Mr. Forke told me in the same connection that he had checked up on the Department and that he had written to his predecessor regarding the work of the Department, and the number of permits which had been issued, and that his predecessor had further referred him to the record of his predecessor in the Cabinet. I think those things are perhaps relevant.

I think, gentlemen, that is all I have to say in this connection.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Have you given us as nearly as you can from memory the whole conversation you had with Mr. Forke, upon which you based your statement made before a public audience?—A. As nearly as possible, yes.

Q. You have given us all?—A. Yes. I will answer that definitely, yes.

Q. Therefore, when you made the statement which you did, which was read by the Secretary of this Committee, it was based on a statement alleged to have been made to you by Mr. Forke with regard to a former Member of the House of Commons?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And no other person was implicated directly or indirectly by Mr. Forke's statement?—A. I would not say that, sir, because the whole conversation was such that I certainly believed that the issue of permits, not necessarily to or by Members of Parliament—

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. It is the Members of Parliament about whom we are speaking.—A. I was not speaking about Members of Parliament at the time I made this address.

Q. Go on.—A. I was dealing with the whole issue of permits.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. When you said at this meeting, reported in the Regina Leader of November 24th, 1927,

I know who have sold them, I know at least some of the members of Parliament who have sold them, and I know what the records of the Department were under both Hon. Mr. Stewart and his successor. Definitely, I know the names of some members who sold these permits.

I should say Mr. Campbell was not one of these Members.

Now, I ask you if you based that statement which I have quoted from the Regina Leader, and which you admit was a fairly correct synopsis of your statement, upon the conversation with Mr. Forke relating solely to Mr. McMurray? I ask you if that is the fact?—A. No sir. I mentioned that another man came to Mr. Forke—

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. A defeated candidate?—A. I think I said a defeated Member.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. You mentioned another one?—A. Yes sir.

Q. So this statement which I have read was based upon a statement alleged to have been made to you by Mr. Forke—A. Yes sir.

Q. —and some statement made by Mr. Forke with regard to another Member?—A. I do not quite understand you.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

Q. Does your second statement, in which you used the words "defeated Member" relate to the defeated Member mentioned to you by Mr. Forke?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And your statement as reported in the Leader, which I have quoted from, was based upon the alleged statement by Mr. Forke with regard to Mr. McMurray and another Member who had been defeated?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And solely with regard to these two instances?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who was the other Member who had been defeated?—A. I said before that I did not catch his name.

Q. And you now admit, because you are on oath, that you made these broad charges because of an alleged statement to you by Mr. Forke with regard to Mr. McMurray and another defeated Member whose name you do not now remember?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And you had no other evidence before you?—A. May I say this; that I made the statement I made on the conversation with Mr. Forke. I never referred to them at any time as "charges". I made that perfectly clear in my address, that I was not speaking from truths in my own possession.

Q. I withdraw the word "charges" but this was the grossest slander I have seen published in the press for some time, if it was made on that. Leave out the word "charges". You made the statement which you did affecting the honour of members of this Parliament, alleging that they had obtained and sold permits, knowing that all that you knew was an alleged reference by Mr. Forke to the two former Members of Parliament to whom I have referred, Mr. McMurray and another whose name you did not mention?—A. I would say this, sir, that when a Minister of the Crown gives me information of that description I accept it as being correct.

Q. I am not saying whether it is correct or not; we will ascertain that from the Minister of the Crown, but I am asking you whether that was the basis of the statement which you made with regard to Members of Parliament. You said "I know they sold them; I know at least some of the Members of Parliament who have sold them" and you add, "I know what the records of the Department were under both Hon. Mr. Stewart and his successor. Definitely I know the names of some Members who sold these permits." This statement referred solely and exclusively to Mr. McMurray and to the Member whose name you have forgotten?—A. Yes sir. That, perhaps, is a correct interpretation to put upon it at this time—

I am asking you, when you were making that statement what was in your mind? Do you know of anything, either personally or by information alleged to have been obtained from Mr. Forke, with respect to any other Members of Parliament?—A. No, sir. I have never professed to have any information other than Mr. Forke's statement in my possession. I said in the address, sir, that I was using the information based on the records of the highest authority on immigration in the country. I think those were the words I used.

Q. Now, will you allow me? In another part of your statement you say—

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: That is another speech made after Mr. Campbell spoke.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Then, addressing the same public meeting you say: "I know one man, not a Member of Parliament, an official who was suddenly transferred to some other part of the world".—A. No sir.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Campbell said that.

Mr. CAHAN: I beg your pardon. Perhaps we will have to call Mr. Campbell. In the earlier part of your address you are reported as saying:

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

"A regular traffic was carried on at Ottawa in the sale of permits to admit men who were not originally eligible for entry into Canada. These permits were sold by Members of Parliament in Canada for the sum of \$100 each. That went on for several years. I am not stating what I do not know to be an absolute fact. It is not hearsay; it is not guesswork; I got that possibly from the highest authority in Canada on immigration affairs. These permits were sold and the bars were let down and people were allowed to flow in who were not ordinarily eligible for our immigration." From whom did you obtain the information that permits were sold by Members of Parliament in Canada for \$100?—A. From Mr. Forke.

Q. Then what did you mean when you said you had given us the whole purport of your conversation?—A. I think I showed you that Mr. Forke did mention to me that these permits were obtained for the sum of \$100.

Q. I do not understand that.—A. I mentioned that in my statement.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. What I understood you to say was that Mr. Forke told you about a man approaching him, and he refused to give him his permits and he asked this man what there was in it for him if he got them, and he said \$100 each. Was that your friend from Regina?—A. No sir.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Now, did Mr. Forke tell you, as a layman, that these permits were sold by Members of Parliament in Canada for the sum of \$100 each, and that that went on for several years? Did Mr. Forke make that statement?—A. That was the inference and the understanding I obtained from the conversation with Mr. Forke.

Q. Leave out your inference and your understandings, which may depend upon your own mind, and upon an exaggerated form of expression. Tell us exactly what Mr. Forke said with regard to that.—A. Mr. Forke told me that when the gentleman who wanted a large number signed came to see him he told him they were issued for a fee of \$100 each—

Q. But they had never been issued?—A. May I point this out, that Mr. Forke very clearly intimated to me that that was the usual fee at which these permits were sold.

Q. Can you remember the words Mr. Forke used?—A. It is now fifteen months ago—

Q. Tell me as best you can, free from your own inferences. We want to know what Mr. Forke said.—A. I am on oath—

Q. Yes. If you say you cannot remember, well and good, but tell us as nearly as your memory will permit exactly what Mr. Forke said.—A. I will not attempt to quote words, not having thought of that particular point in the interim.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You quoted them eight months afterwards.—A. Oh no, sir.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. What was the date of your conversation with Mr. Forke?—A. March 15th, 1927.

Q. And you delivered this address on November 23rd, 1927?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And you were giving them, as I understand you now to say, the purport of a statement made to you by Mr. Forke?—A. Yes.

Q. Now state, as nearly as you can again, the purport of the statement made to you by Mr. Forke in respect to the \$100 payment.—A. Very well, sir. I would

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

say this, that Mr. Forke told me in discussing this matter that day in this connection that the fee was \$100, and he added "If I wished, I could become a millionaire in this Department".

Q. When he said that the fee was \$100, to what did he refer? Did he say these lawyers or Members of Parliament who were applying for permits received in consideration for their good offices \$100 each?—A. That the people getting these permits were handing them out for \$100.

Q. Did you understand that that applied to any official of the Immigration Department—that officials were receiving any payments?—A. No, sir.

Q. You understood it to refer solely to the Members of Parliament who were applying for permits?—A. No sir, certainly not. I understood it to apply to men like the man who got the letter of introduction from me, to get those permits and use them.

Q. But you say "These permits were sold by Members of Parliament in Canada for the sum of \$100", and I would ask you what there was in Mr. Forke's statement which would lead you, as an honest citizen of the country, to allege that these permits were sold by Members of Parliament in Canada for the sum of \$100 each?—A. I think I have tried to explain that very clearly. I think that statement is quite clearly understood.

Q. I cannot understand it. I cannot make out your inferences. But in relation to Mr. McMurray and to the other defeated candidate—A. I did not say "candidate".

Q. Who were the only members mentioned as I understood it—A. Yes.

Q. —did Mr. Forke say that Mr. McMurray and this other defeated candidate, as Members of Parliament, received \$100 each for getting permits?—A. Mr. Forke certainly did indicate that Mr. McMurray received it.

Q. Is that the former Solicitor General of Canada?—A. I believe so, yes.

Q. You went farther after Mr. Campbell had spoken and thrown some slight doubt upon the accuracy of your statement—I think I might put it that way, mildly—and you said: "I know what the records of the Department were under both Hon. Mr. Stewart and his successor". Now, to what records of the Department under the Hon. Mr. Stewart, did you refer?—A. Mr. Chairman, I point this out—

Q. Will you please answer my question?—A. May I say that this is an abbreviated report of my address and there are some combinations of words there which are either a synopsis of what I said or do not elaborate in the way I elaborated on that occasion.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: You said it was substantially correct.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Now, I have had some experience in examining witnesses and I would like to know what you knew directly or indirectly when you said: "I know what the records of the Department were under both Hon. Mr. Stewart and his successor". Hon. Mr. Stewart is a member of the Government; he is an eminent Member of this House of Commons and we want to know what you had in mind in your reference there to the Hon. Mr. Stewart.—A. I had this in mind, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Forke made the comment to me that when he found the number of permits which had been issued, he wrote to his predecessor—

Q. Who was that?—A. Of the Meighen Cabinet—Doctor Manion, I think it was. He did not mention the name to me, but I think that is who it was. I am speaking now from memory—and that that gentleman replied to him referring him to the records of his predecessor, who was the Hon. Mr. Stewart, and Mr. Forke said that when he looked into those records he found that the condition had existed, that in fact—and he used these words or as nearly as possible these words, or words which at least indicated this, that the condition was even worse.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

Q. To what condition are you referring? To the condition under which Members of Parliament received \$100 for getting permits?—A. No sir.

Q. To the condition under which permits were granted?—A. To the condition that permits were being given out to people over the country who were using them improperly.

Q. In what way did they use them improperly?—A. People were getting them who ordinarily were not entitled to come into Canada, and they were paying the people getting them sums of money for them.

Q. Permits are only granted in the case of people who ordinarily are not permitted to come in?—A. Yes.

Q. Was the statement made, or were words used by Mr. Forke, which would indicate that under the Hon. Mr. Stewart or under his successor in office permits were obtained and that those who obtained them were receiving improperly large sums of money for obtaining them?—A. That was certainly my understanding, sir.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Did I say it? Do not say what your understanding is.

By Mr. Glen:

Q. In your statement you say that you know.—A. Yes sir.

Q. Then in speaking on a public platform you were speaking of something you think was told to you?—A. Yes sir.

Q. I would like to make this absolutely clear. So far as this statement made by you at Regina is concerned it was based on a conversation you had with Mr. Forke and had reference only to two men, E. J. McMurray and the defeated man?—A. No sir.

Q. You said so in answer to Mr. Cahan.—A. No sir. I said "two Members of Parliament", but I had discussed the permit system in a much larger way than that because, Mr. Chairman, I have explained to the Committee how this thing first came to my attention.

Q. But you said in answer to Mr. Cahan that it only referred to two men, one man you named and the other man you could not name.—A. I answered Mr. Cahan to that effect, but I said those were the names given to me, but I did not say those were the only two names which might have been given to me.

Q. But you did not know, did you?—A. I do not, sir, but I know of two.

Q. Then we can assume that your whole statement was based on the names of two men who "are Members of Parliament" as you put it in your statement. These two men were not Members at the time you were speaking.—A. I did not say they were Members of Parliament; I said they were Members of Parliament but prior to Mr. Forke's ministry.

Q. No, you did not.—A. I beg your pardon.

Q. You make the accusation that all Members of Parliament are trafficking in permits?—A. Absolutely not.

Q. Is that not the only inference we can draw, that Members of Parliament are getting \$100 each for getting permits?—A. I do not think so. I say this, though, that in order to get an investigation of this kind into the records of a Department if two men have been doing this, the whole Department should be investigated. That was my contention.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. May I ask if the defeated candidate was ever a Member of Parliament?—A. I never said "defeated candidate". I do not see why the Members of this Committee are so frequently quoting me as having said "defeated candidate".

Q. You cannot remember his name? Do you remember what province he comes from?—A. Yes sir; at least, I remember the part of the country in which it was indicated to me he lives.

Q. Where was that?—A. He lived in the maritime provinces.

Q. Do you remember which province?—A. No sir. "Maritime provinces" was the only thing mentioned.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Was it your understanding from your conversation with Mr. Forke that trafficking in permits for gain was general amongst those who were so trafficking, or simply the two to whom you have referred?—A. Yes sir, that is exactly what I have been trying to explain.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. In reference to your statement about the Hon. Mr. Stewart, in which you say: "I know at least some of the Members of Parliament who have sold them and I know what the records of the department were under both Hon. Mr. Stewart and his successor." Did Mr. Forke specifically mention the name of Mr. Stewart?—A. No, it was the word "predecessor."

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. I understood you to make the statement to the effect that the Minister of Immigration stated if he wished he could have become a millionaire through issuing these permits?—A. Yes.

Q. Could you inform the Committee if there was any money received by the officials of the department in connection with these permits?—A. No sir, I can not, but I may say, since Mr. Stewart's name was perhaps introduced, that I was trying to make clear what I meant by "predecessor" and "successor" but I had no intention of conveying the impression—I would not have the Committee think for one moment that I wish to cast any slur whatsoever upon the Hon. Mr. Stewart. I want that to be perfectly clear.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Then would you tell us exactly the words Mr. Forke used which made you attribute these fraudulent acts to the regime of Hon. Mr. Stewart?—A. Yes, I will be glad to do that. I think I have already done so, in this way; Mr. Forke told me he wrote a letter to his predecessor drawing his attention to the number of permits issued during his regime, and that his predecessor had written a letter to him pointing out the number of permits issued during the regime of his predecessor who was, of course, the Hon. Mr. Stewart.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. You have known Mr. Forke for some time?—A. Yes, I have met Mr. Forke.

Q. Were you not intimate friends?—A. No, I would not say that. I met Mr. Forke on one occasion in Regina, and I have corresponded with him since that time.

Q. You became thoroughly intimate?—A. I would not say we were fairly intimate, but we were good friends.

Q. You have told a great deal of what Mr. Forke said to you. Did it never strike your mind that part of this at least was a private conversation? A. Well, I think Mr. Millar you will know that I am in a position in the city of Regina where I have, I think, the confidence of a large number of the people and there are also a number of people who make of me a confidant. I do not think I have ever had the reputation for divulging a confidence, but I may say this, that within four hours of that conversation with Mr. Forke I discussed it quite freely, frankly and openly with Mr. Geo. F. Edwards of the United Farmers of Saskatchewan. Had I considered this to be either personal or confidential I would not have discussed it with any third party.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

Q. That does not exactly answer the question. Did it ever cross your mind that a part of this conversation was a private conversation?—A. You notice I did not use this publicly at all until my statement was challenged that permits had been improperly used and I felt justified in coming back as strongly as I could to defend myself from the inference that what I had said was not true.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Were your relations with Mr. Forke of such an intimate character that it occurred to your mind that he might impart to you information he would not impart to others?—A. No, sir.

By Hon. Mr. Stewart:

Q. You say your statement was challenged. Was that the statement made by Mr. Campbell?—A. Perhaps "challenged" is a little strong, Mr. Stewart, but some doubt was thrown upon the remarks I made.

Q. Was that the statement of Mr. Campbell at the same meeting?—A. Yes, that there were rumours.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Mr. Coldwell, will you just tell us exactly, as nearly as you can, what Mr. Forke said to you about Mr. McMurray. I want to see what the foundation of it is.—A. Mr. Forke told me quite definitely that Mr. McMurray had obtained these permits in large numbers; that he had obtained sufficient to meet his election expenses, and Mr. Forke's comment was "As you know, Mr. Coldwell, election expenses are large in a city like Winnipeg".

Q. And it is on that statement that you base your evidence given here to-day with regard to Mr. McMurray's part in the transaction?—A. The statement I have already made this morning. I have elaborated on that to some extent.

Q. I am asking you to elaborate as much as you please so long as you stick to what Mr. Forke said to you with regard to Mr. McMurray. Please repeat again what Mr. Forke said with regard to Mr. McMurray, and all he said.—A. Mr. Forke told me that Mr. McMurray had obtained large numbers of these permits which had been used in the manner I suggested—Mr. Forke suggested they had been sold, and that election expenses had been met in that way, and that election expenses in the city of Winnipeg were high. Those are, as near as I can remember, the effect of Mr. Forke's words.

Q. And I say it is on that statement that you base what you have said here this morning with regard to Mr. McMurray.—A. I do not quite see the point.

Q. Never mind whether you see the point or not. I am asking you if it is upon that statement that you base what you have said here this morning with regard to Mr. McMurray.—A. That statement, and on the fact that it was in connection with the sale of immigration permits that this conversation occurred, and that the sum of \$100 for these permits had been mentioned. On those statements I base the statement I have made here this morning.

Q. The sum of \$100 was not mentioned in connection with Mr. McMurray, but was mentioned in connection with another man, from the maritime provinces, I understand, who had said to Mr. Forke that there was \$100 in it for him.—A. For Mr. Forke?

Q. No, for the man.—A. Yes.

Q. That was the only occasion upon which \$100 was mentioned.—A. I would not say that was the only occasion, no sir.

Q. Is that the only occasion you remember now or will you tell me of another in connection with anything else where the sum of \$100 for permits was mentioned?—A. The conversation revolved around this particular point—

Q. Never mind revolving. We are trying to get down to something definite as to what the foundation was for this statement with regard to \$100. I am asking you if there was any other conversation or a portion of any conversation in which \$100 was mentioned except in connection with the man who Mr. Forke had said had intimated to him there was \$100 in it for him.—A. Mr. Forke clearly indicated—

Q. Tell us what he said.—A. Word for word?

Q. Substantially.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Was it intimated that Mr. McMurray was selling permits for \$100 apiece?

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. I am asking you to give any part of any conversation in which \$100 per permit was mentioned other than in connection with the man from the maritime provinces—who, by the way, had not got \$100 but who had intimated there was \$100 in it for him.—A. Yes; earlier in the conversation such a suggestion was made—

Q. Never mind any suggestions—A. Well, such a statement was made. Mr. Forke told me these permits were sold by people who got for them \$100.

Q. Did he tell you that Members of Parliament sold them for \$100?—A. Members of Parliament?

Q. Yes.—A. Was that not clearly indicated in the connection which we have been discussing this morning?

Q. Do not ask me a question; you answer mine. I am asking you if Mr. Forke indicated, except in connection with this man from the maritime provinces, if Members of Parliament were getting \$100, and if he did intimate that, tell us what he said.—A. I am trying to do that. I am on oath and I will not say what I do not believe to be absolutely true.

Q. Can you tell us any other portion of the conversation in which Mr. Forke mentioned that Members of Parliament were getting \$100 excepting this conversation you have detailed with regard to the man from the maritime provinces?—A. The case of Mr. McMurray.

Q. Go on. Any others?—A. The other cases of people who had applied for permits and not been allowed to receive them.

Q. Will you give us any portion of a conversation in which Mr. Forke intimated that Members of Parliament were getting \$100 except the portion of the conversation relating to the man from the maritime provinces?—A. Other than the two cases mentioned, no.

Q. And he did not, as a matter of fact, mention that Mr. McMurray was getting \$100?—A. He mentioned that Mr. McMurray's election expenses—

Q. Please answer my question. He did not mention that Mr. McMurray was getting \$100?—A. I would not swear that he did.

Q. Now, in reference to Mr. Millar's question again; you were sufficiently intimate with Mr. Forke to feel you were at liberty to give a friend of yours a letter of introduction to him?—A. Well, between public men—

Q. Please be good enough to answer that question. Does that not suggest intimacy? You can answer that question by "Yes" or "No." You were sufficiently intimate to feel that you could give a letter of introduction to a friend of yours to Mr. Forke?—A. I protest, sir, that the word "intimate" has a peculiar meaning

Q. Let us get on with the examination.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the witness should answer the question.

The WITNESS: I was friendly with Mr. Forke.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. And sufficiently friendly to feel that he would respect a letter you gave to a friend?—A. Yes.

Q. And you gave that letter knowing that the friend was going to have something to do with regard to the Immigration Department?—A. I did not. That is the very point; I did not.

Q. What did you expect he was going to do with it?—A. He told me he was coming down to Ottawa on a trip, that he knew certain members of the Cabinet; he had never met Mr. Forke, who was a new Minister, and he would like to drop in and see him. That was his explanation to me.

Q. Then it was purely a personal visit and the letter you gave to him was not on business matters at all?—A. No.

Q. Is that so?—A. That is so.

Q. And you discovered what his real business was, namely, to attempt to get permits, and, as you say, the matter of your own personal honour was involved?—A. Yes.

Q. And therefore you called on Mr. Forke to explain to him that when you had given that letter of introduction you did not understand the errand on which this man had gone?—A. That is correct.

Q. And you did not ask Mr. Forke his reason for refusing the permits at all?—A. No.

Q. And he went on to talk with you. By the way, this conversation was just between the two of you, with regard to his difficulties in the department?—A. Yes.

Q. As a friend?—A. In connection with permits. The letter I gave had raised the question of permits.

Q. But that did not raise the necessity of Mr. Forke giving you this information about refusing permits, did it?—A. Mr. Forke took the occasion to do so.

Q. He took the occasion to tell you about his difficulties in the department?—A. Yes.

Q. You were not a public man; you were not bound to receive that confidence from him or bound to demand it from him?—A. No.

Q. And you were not there in any official capacity which required him to communicate this information to you?—A. No.

Q. It simply raised whatever personal conversation and personal explanation by you to him as to why you had given this letter of introduction to your friends?—A. That construction can be placed upon it.

Q. And Mr. Forke went on to explain what his difficulties were. Would you not say that that was purely because of your friendship with him? Do you think he would talk to anybody else as he would to you, anybody not an official connected with the department?—A. I do not believe he would talk to anybody just like that.

Q. And he would not talk to anyone except somebody in whom he had confidence?—A. Yes.

Q. And you say that about four hours afterwards you retailed this conversation to Mr. Edwards?—A. Yes.

Q. And when you got on the platform at Regina, even then you did not think it well to give the information which you gave until after Mr. Campbell had spoken?—A. No.

Q. It was only when Mr. Campbell sort of put you on your mettle?—A. That is hardly correct. I think Mr. Campbell was there and he will tell you that I was not heated.

Q. I did not say you were heated, but you were very much more definite in your second speech than you were in your first?—A. Certainly.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

Q. And had it not been for Mr. Campbell you would not have divulged what Mr. Forke said in the way you did?—A. I think in the first speech I gave a very clear indication.

Q. I am asking you if you would have divulged the statement that you knew the names of people and were prepared to give the names, had it not been for what Mr. Campbell said in his speech?—A. It is quite likely that on some future occasion—not that particular evening. My speech was done for that evening.

Q. Why did you not do it in your first speech?—A. It is pretty difficult to say six or seven months after something happened.

Q. I am asking for your answer on that. The fact is that you did regard this as sort of a private conversation and you did not feel in your first speech that you were quite justified in intimating that you knew the names of people, and it was after Mr. Campbell had rather cast some doubt on your statement that you made the second address?—A. No, I would not say that.

Q. Can you give us any reason for not having said what you said in your second speech in your first speech?—A. One reason would be this—

Q. There was one reason? What restrained you from saying it in your first speech?—A. One reason was this, that I was discussing the immigration policy on the whole, and I made a comparatively brief allusion in the first instance to this particular condition. I did not elaborate. That was the reason.

Q. Is the newspaper report of your first speech practically verbatim?—A. No. The newspaper report is substantially correct. By that I mean this, that it is written up in a journalistic way and there are portions of my remarks cut out between paragraphs or sentences.

Q. I am asking you if the report of the first address did not practically contain all you said on this subject of permits?—A. Yes.

Q. And you did not in that intimate that you knew the name of anybody?—A. No, I did not.

Q. I am asking you why you did not?—A. I think I have explained that.

Q. Will you explain it again? I am afraid I did not catch a portion of your explanation?—A. My speech was devoted to immigration as a whole. I made but a passing allusion to these conditions. I did not elaborate. I think you will agree with me that quite often when making a speech—

Q. Do not bother about what I agree with you upon. Let us stick to the facts. You said you made a "passing allusion"? Do you call this a "passing allusion":

A regular traffic was carried on at Ottawa of the sale of permits to admit men who were not ordinarily eligible for entry into Canada. These permits were sold by Members of Parliament in Canada for the sum of \$100 each. That went on for several years. I am not stating what I do not know to be an absolute fact. It is not hearsay, it is not guesswork. I got that possibly from the highest source in Canada on immigration affairs. These permits were sold and the bars were let down and people were allowed to flow in who were not ordinarily eligible for our immigration.

You regard that as a passing allusion, do you?—A. You asked me why I did not, until Mr. Campbell spoke, say what I said? I was explaining why I did not say what I said later on; it was in further elaboration.

Q. You said that in your first speech you made a "passing allusion". I ask you again if you regard that paragraph as a "passing allusion"?—A. I was explaining that when making a speech one makes but passing allusions.

Q. Do you regard that as a passing allusion?—A. No.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

Q. Then it was not a passing allusion you made in your first speech?—A. It was in so far that I did not give the details which Mr. Campbell's question brought out later on.

Q. And you call that "a passing allusion"? Do you want to correct that?—A. I would correct it in the way I suggest, that I did not elaborate further until Mr. Campbell had raised the question. Then I said what was reported later on.

Q. You gave as your reason for that that you were only making a passing allusion in your first speech. What Mr. Campbell said was that there were rumours that Members of Parliament and others were dealing in permits.—A. Yes.

Q. Then you felt called upon to make the statement that you knew the names?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you know that either of these men were Members of Parliament at this time?—A. The Members of Parliament at the present time were never mentioned.

Q. This speech was made in November, 1927?—A. Yes.

Q. The statement is, "I know at least some of the Members of Parliament who have sold them".—A. I never at any stage stated that the men were Members of Parliament now.

Q. You did not think that inference would be drawn from what you said?—A. Well, the reporter may have had—

Q. You did not think that inference would be drawn from what you said?—A. Well, I did not think so at the time, no, because I said "prior to Mr. Forke's ministry".

Q. And you did not intend to?—A. No.

Q. And you know nothing whatsoever with regard to the present Members of Parliament?—A. I know nothing with regard to the present Members of Parliament.

Q. Did Mr. Forke in his statement say that it was rumoured, or this was what he heard?—A. No sir. I do not remember at any stage that the word "rumours" was mentioned.

Q. Or "gossip"?—A. No.

Q. You mean to tell me that Mr. Forke said he knew that as an absolute fact?—A. He did not say "absolute fact" but I clearly understood—

Q. Do you mean to tell me that Mr. Forke said that he had personal knowledge?—A. Mr. Forke?

Q. Yes. Did he say that he had personal knowledge of this? You understand that?—A. Let me say this: that Mr. Forke gave me this, that he believed that to be the case.

Q. But you do not say at any stage that he said he had personal knowledge? That question can be answered by "Yes" or "No"?—A. Yes, many questions can be answered by "Yes" or "No," but it conveyed to me—

Q. I did not ask you that. You did not say at any stage that he said he had personal knowledge?—A. Personal knowledge?

Q. Yes, personal knowledge?—A. I certainly believed that Mr. Forke had.

Q. Will you be good enough to answer my question. You did not say at any stage that Mr. Forke had personal knowledge?—A. I would say then, No.

Q. Mr. Forke, you knew, only came into office in October, 1926?—A. Yes.

Q. And you understood that whatever was referred to was something that had taken place before Mr. Forke came into office at all?—A. Yes.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Mr. Coldwell, to clear up a point: did Mr. Forke lead you to believe that he had knowledge that Mr. McMurray was getting \$100 apiece for these permits?—A. Yes.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Was \$100 mentioned, or was it your inference from his remarks that Mr. McMurray had been getting or wanted to get money to pay his election expenses in that way?—A. That was the inference.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: He has not answered your question. You asked if \$100 was mentioned or the inference that he wanted to get some money for election expenses.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Was \$100 mentioned in that connection?—A. Yes, in that connection.

Q. And it was also your inference that Mr. McMurray wanted these—from your conversation with Mr. Forke—to pay election expenses?—A. No. Mr. Forke's comment on the sale of these permits which Mr. McMurray had received was that election expenses were high.

Q. One other question. Reference has been dwelt upon by the Hon. Mr. Ralston of your intimacy with Mr. Forke. How long have you known Mr. Forke?—A. Since October, 1925.

Q. How many times have you met Mr. Forke?—A. I met him in October, 1925.

Q. How long were you in conversation with him then?—A. We spoke from the same platform.

Q. At a meeting?—A. Yes.

Q. In 1925?—A. Yes.

Q. The election of 1925?—A. Yes.

Q. When did you next meet him?—A. At Ottawa in March last year.

Q. That was twice you had met him?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you met him since that time except on this trip?—A. No.

Q. You have communicated with him by letters?—A. Yes.

Q. You referred to a letter you wrote to him?—A. Yes.

Q. Was that a letter relating to the sale of permits?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you a copy of that letter here?—A. It was relating to this speech, more particularly.

Q. But it referred to the sale of permits?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you get an answer from Mr. Forke?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you both the letter and the answer here?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you please place them on the record?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. At the time Mr. Forke and yourself spoke from the same platform—

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Let us finish with the letters first.

The WITNESS: Shall I read them?

Mr. SPENCE: Read the two letters.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: There are more than two.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I have asked for two; you can get the rest.

The CHAIRMAN: Are these marked "Personal"?

The WITNESS: Yes, one is marked "Personal". I did that because I wanted it to go directly to Mr. Forke and not be opened in the departmental manner.

By Hon. Mr. Motherwell:

Q. What is the date?

The WITNESS: Regina, November 27th, 1927.

The CHAIRMAN: Read the letter.

The WITNESS: (Reading):

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

Personal

1666 ATHOL ST.,

REGINA, SASK., Nov. 27th, 1927.

The Hon. ROBERT FORKE,
Minister of Immigration,
Ottawa.

DEAR MR. FORKE: You will probably note from press despatches that a great deal has been made of a statement I made at the Sons of England Hall in this city last Wednesday evening.

In the course of an address on immigration I made the suggestion that at times during the past few years when the officials were placing bars against certain classes of immigrants, permits were given to those who found difficulty in getting in, for a fee, and that, to the credit of the present Minister it should be stated, this had been stopped.

In the discussion which followed my address, Mr. Milton Campbell suggested that these were rumours. In my reply, I assured Mr. Campbell that these were not rumours and that certain permits had been issued for a hundred dollar fee, and that I knew of persons, including members of Parliament at the time, who had secured these permits for fees. This was written up rather startlingly and evidently sent broadcast over the Dominion, eliciting a carefully worded rejoinder from your deputy, Mr. Egan. When apprised of this over the telephone I replied as indicated in the press-clipping enclosed. Yesterday, I was out of the city, but I find that the *Leader* has editorial reference to my remarks.

You will, no doubt, remember our conversation in this connection last spring when you gave me the information, amongst others, to which I referred the other evening. Our discussion was quite front and was not of a confidential nature so that I felt, when my statement met with some question, I was at liberty to make the explanation.

I would regret very much to cause you any personal inconvenience or worry, but I feel that since this matter has been given some publicity it will no doubt come directly to your attention, and I am hopeful that such steps will be taken as will teach the persons responsible for this abuse of immigration permits a well-deserved lesson.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) M. J. COLDWELL.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Now, read the reply.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. That is not marked "Personal"?—A. No, nor "Confidential".

The WITNESS (reading):

OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION,
OTTAWA, CANADA, December 7th, 1927.

M. J. COLDWELL, Esq., Alderman,
Regina, Sask.

DEAR MR. COLDWELL,—Upon my return to Ottawa yesterday your letter of November 27th has been received. I note what you say concerning the conversation we had last spring with reference to the issuance of permits. I do not recall the conversation but I wish to emphasize most distinctly that I was at no time in a position nor did I ever say that Members of Parliament were trafficking for personal gain in immi-

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

gration permits. I do not understand what I could have said which would make it possible for you to place such an interpretation on my statement. If you have any definite grounds for your supposition I shall be glad if you will furnish me, confidentially, if not otherwise, the names of those whom you definitely know who were in receipt of money for permits procured from this Department.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) ROBERT FORKE.

I replied to that—

Mr. SPENCE: Read the reply.

The WITNESS: This is the letter dated December 12th, 1927, at Regina, Sask. (Reading):

1666 ATHOL ST.,

REGINA, SASK., Dec. 12, 1927.

The Hon. ROBERT FORKE,
Minister of Immigration,
Ottawa.

DEAR MR. FORKE: Your letter of Dec. 7th reached me this morning. To say the least I was exceedingly surprised to learn that you do not recall the details of our conversation which took place in your office on March last.

I have a very excellent memory for detail and, moreover, I believe I have a reputation for never making any statement the truth of which I am not thoroughly convinced.

Now I state most advisedly that, in discussing the issuance of immigration permits, you gave me a great deal of information of the conditions which existed prior to your ministry and told me of specific instances where you had refused to issue them because you knew that those obtaining them were going to profit financially from them. You also mentioned the name of a gentleman who had occupied a position of some prominence in our parliamentary life and who represented a large urban constituency, who had obtained enough permits to pay his election expenses.

Your statements appeared to be so definite and conclusive that I accepted them without question but with a feeling that I was glad that you were determined to put an end to the practice.

Since my memory is so clear, and since I told certain friends substantially what you had told me immediately this conversation had occurred, I am quite prepared to give an accurate summary of our conversation whenever it may be necessary to do so. I am, however, of the opinion that it is only necessary for me to draw the above facts to your attention and you will thereupon remember that whatever you may have found subsequently you were, in March last, in possession of information which led you to tell me in your capacity as Minister of Immigration that the condition to which I refer had existed prior to your ministry and this Parliament. Further, that the attention of the Prime Minister had been drawn to your determination by one who had been defeated in the elections and who felt himself deprived of something to which he was entitled, but that Mr. King had informed you that you were entirely responsible for your own department.

Your very truly,

(Signed) M. J. COLDWELL.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Was there any reply?—A. A confidential letter.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: There is nothing confidential in anything I said.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): If the Minister waives that part of it, it is all right.

The WITNESS (Reading):

Confidential.

OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION,
OTTAWA, CANADA, December 16, 1927.

M. J. COLDWELL, Esq.,
1666 Athol Street,
Regina, Sask.

DEAR MR. COLDWELL: In reply to your letter of the 12th instant I can only repeat what I said in the former letter. I certainly never made a statement that I knew of members receiving money for permits. In private conversation with you as a friend I remember repeating some of the rumours I heard in this connection. I hardly expected this to go further. Now as a matter of fact I have no knowledge that any Member ever received money for permits and could not make any such statement. As to the rumours I told you of, they were much the same no doubt as your friend had heard and who was very much more guarded in his statements in Regina.

I regret the fact that you made a public statement that in any way related to a private conversation you had with me.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) ROBERT FORKE.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. I would like to ask one question before we adjourn. In the public meeting at which you and Mr. Forke spoke from the same platform—was that a political meeting?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you and Mr. Forke on opposite sides?—A. No. Mr. Forke was the House leader of the Progressive group and at that time I was running as the Progressive candidate in the city of Regina.

Q. You were asking Mr. Forke to assist you in your campaign?—A. He was speaking in various cities. I had not been in touch with Mr. Forke; the committee had been in touch with him and had arranged it.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. You felt you were sufficiently acquainted with him as a candidate of the party of which he was leader to warrant you in giving a letter of introduction to your friend?—A. Yes.

Q. That was the extent of your intimacy?—A. Yes.

Q. Your political connection?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. And I understand you to say that on that occasion and the occasion in Ottawa were the only times you had met Mr. Forke personally?—A. Yes.

Q. That is correct?—A. I think so.

Q. Did not Mr. Forke address two of your schools?—A. That was the same date. Mr. Forke and I went to the political meeting in the evening together. We had a chat which probably lasted fifteen or twenty minutes on the general political situation. Then Mr. Forke went off to address a couple of meetings in, I think, the collegiate institute and the normal school.

Q. Schools under your direction?—A. No, they are not.

Q. Were you not with him?—A. No, I was not with Mr. Forke. I think Mr. J. M. Thomas was with him.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. Did you not introduce me as the speaker?—A. No.

The witness retired.

The Committee adjourned until Wednesday morning, May 16, 1928, at 11 a.m.

(Signed) ROBERT FORKE

Your very truly

(Signed) ROBERT FORKE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, May 16, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, when we adjourned yesterday until this morning I was not aware that a Conservative caucus had been called for the same time. I was informed of that yesterday afternoon by the Chief Whip of the Conservative party with the request that the Committee should not meet at the same time. Of course, it is always usual for committees not to meet when there is a caucus of one of the parties. That is not a rule, but it is common practice and I am inclined to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. CAHAN: Before you suggest any adjournment I think there is one matter which should be disposed of. The evidence brought out yesterday clearly necessitates the presence of Mr. McMurray before the Committee, and I would move that Mr. McMurray be called. He has been placed, so far as the evidence now stands, in rather an invidious position and he should have the opportunity to explain his position in the matter.

Discussion followed.

Motion agreed to.

The Committee adjourned until 4 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Committee resumed at 4 p.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I move that Doctor Manion be heard.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: There is a witness on the stand.

Hon. Mr. MANION: I quite agree with you Mr. Ralston, but I have a short statement to make in regard to my name being mentioned yesterday. It will only take five minutes to put the evidence straight. I would like to have the privilege of making about a five minute statement before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the Committee to hear Doctor Manion?

Carried.

Hon. Mr. MANION: I have written out this statement so that there will be no possible misconception. (Reads):

It was drawn to my attention last evening that a witness, Mr. Coldwell, had yesterday before this Committee mentioned my name in such a way that by inference a misunderstanding might easily arise and the conclusion be drawn that during my regime as Acting Minister of Immigration permits for entrance to this country were irregularly issued in large numbers. Let me quote the reference to myself by the witness:—

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Now, I have had some experience in examining witnesses and I would like to know what you knew directly or indirectly when you said: "I know what the records of the Department were under both Hon. Mr.

[Hon. Dr. Manion.]

Stewart and his successor." Hon. Mr. Stewart is a member of the Government; he is an eminent member of this House of Commons and we want to know what you had in mind in your reference there to the Hon. Mr. Stewart.

Mr. COLDWELL: I had this in mind, Mr. Chairman: Mr. Forke made the comment to me that when he found the number of permits which had been issued he wrote to his predecessor—

Q. Who was that?—A. Of the Meighen Cabinet—Dr. Manion, I think it was. He did not mention the name to me, but I think that is who it was. I am speaking now from memory—and that that gentleman replied to him referring him to the records of his predecessor, who was the Hon. Mr. Stewart, and Mr. Forke said that when he looked into those records he found that the condition had existed, that in fact—and he used these words or as nearly as possible these words, or words which at least indicated this, that the condition was even worse.

Q. To what condition are you referring? To the condition under which Members of Parliament received \$100 for getting permits?—A. No, sir.

Q. To the condition under which permits were granted?—A. To the condition that permits were being given out to the people over the country who were using them improperly.

Regarding the above reference to myself I wish to make the following comments:—

(1) I wish to state most emphatically that I have never by word or by letter had any communication whatever with Mr. Forke regarding permits. I feel sure that Mr. Forke will agree with this.

(2) I wish to state just as emphatically that in the time during which I was Acting Minister of Immigration I personally issued no permits to anyone and that no permits were illegally or irregularly issued to anyone. In fact no permits of any kind were issued which were not wholly within the law and the regulations.

(3) I was particularly anxious that no irregularities should take place under my administration, and throughout that time I acted in such manner that no irregularities did take place. I gave instructions along these lines to Mr. Egan, my Deputy, and I have no doubt he lived up to them entirely. By inquiry at the Department, I am informed that nine permits were issued during my regime on special request, but these were wholly within the regulations, being issued in the usual course by the Department.

(4) So far as I know, no traffic in permits of any kind whatever was carried on by anyone during the time that I was Acting Minister.

(5) I am casting reflections upon no one, but make this statement only because my name was brought into the discussion. I make it in justice to myself in order that no false impression may go out from this investigation which might reflect upon myself or upon the Department while I was Acting Minister, as during that time no action of any kind was taken which could reflect either upon myself or upon the Department.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. During what dates were you the Acting Minister?—A. I do not think I can give the exact dates. It was about a month, I think.

Q. What month?—A. From July, 1926, to about a month after that. I cannot give you the dates; I would have to look them up.

Q. You took over first as Acting Minister after the new regime?—A. Yes.

[Hon. Dr. Manion.]

Q. Who succeeded you?—A. One of the ministers who remained in the city. For the very reason that my name may possibly be misconstrued I would prefer not to mention the name. He was one of the ministers who remained in the city. I do not wish to put him in the same position that Mr. Coldwell put me in yesterday by mentioning my name. It was one of the Acting Ministers of our Government who took over when I left.

Q. Were you actively engaged in your department during the month of July?—A. I had a number of departments. I was really acting for about six different departments. That was one of the six.

Q. To-day we are only concerned with the Department of Immigration. Were you actively engaged in connection with this Department during that time?—A. Yes, I was acting minister during the time.

Q. Was anybody else acting at all in that time?—A. Not until I left the city.

Q. During that month you were the only one who was at the head of or had any supervision or jurisdiction over the department?—A. That is absolutely correct.

Q. You know who succeeded you?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know whether that same gentleman continued until the election?—A. I think he did. I do not know positively, but I think he did.

Q. And you are quite sure that during the month, from the time you took office until you say you went away on the election, no one else had anything to do with the issue of permits or anything else?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. Were you in the city all the time?—A. I think I was. I may have been called out for a day or two but generally speaking I was here pretty solidly for three or four weeks.

Q. You say the records of the Department will show to whom you handed over?—A. I should think they would. At least, the Deputy Minister can tell better than I can.

Witness retired.

Major J. W. COLDWELL recalled.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coldwell, you were sworn yesterday and you are still giving evidence under the same oath.

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Mr. Coldwell, you spoke on the platform in Regina with Mr. Campbell, M.P.?—A. Not on the platform, Mr. Ralston.

Q. At this meeting?—A. At this meeting, yes.

Q. You spoke at this meeting with Mr. Campbell, M.P.?—A. No. Perhaps a misconception might arise, so may I just explain that point? I was at this meeting and two gentlemen wished to see me, one of whom was Mr. Campbell. They had an evening in the city of Regina and they called at my home and were told I was at this meeting, and they came just as I began to speak, as I remember it. Mr. Campbell was called upon by the chairman when he knew who was in the hall.

Q. You said he called at your home and you were not there?—A. I was not there.

Q. The meeting was on?—A. Yes.

Q. This was a Sunday Forum at which matters of interest were discussed?—A. No, sir.

Q. What was it?—A. It was a meeting of the Sons of England.

Q. An evening meeting?—A. Yes, an evening meeting.

Q. Was Mr. Campbell a member of the association?—A. No.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

Q. He just happened to drop in to the meeting and was called upon?—
A. Yes.

Q. Had you discussed with Mr. Campbell the matter of permits and immigration matters?—A. No, I had not seen him.

Q. Never previously?—A. Never previously.

Q. I understood you to say yesterday that you discussed with Mr. Edwards this matter soon after you left Mr. Forke's office?—A. Yes.

Q. And with others as well?—A. I do not recollect others. Mr. Edwards and I were together here and we talked thing over pretty generally. Our time while we were here was very much taken up.

Q. Do you mean to say that never from the time you talked it over with Mr. Edwards until you made a speech in Regina you discussed this matter?—
A. No.

Q. You talked it over with various people?—A. I discussed it as soon as I got home with my wife.

Q. I am not asking about domestic matters. You discussed it with various people in the West who were interested in these matters?—A. Yes.

Q. Frequently, I presume?—A. I spoke to—

Q. I am not asking to whom you spoke. I ask you if you discussed it frequently?—A. Several times.

Q. With different individuals?—A. Yes.

Q. And exchanged views with them and they with you?—A. No, I do not think it is fair to say that.

Q. Do you mean to say you did all the talking?—A. I mean to say in this connection I did practically all the talking.

Q. And they did not express any views to you at all?—A. That would be unusual.

Q. I should think so. They expressed views to you as you did to them? Is that so?—A. Yes.

Q. And those were people living out West?—A. Yes.

Q. Interested in immigration matters?—A. Interested generally in good citizenship, I would say.

Q. I am speaking of immigration matters now. Is that so?—A. Yes.

Q. Is it too much to say that you discussed it pretty frequently in—that would be eight months?—A. No, not pretty frequently, no.

Q. Well, frequently?—A. Well, no, not even—I would not say. It depends upon one's definition of "frequently".

By Mr. Boys:

Q. Occasionally?—A. Occasionally.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. How many times?—A. I cannot answer that question.

Q. Did you discuss it anywhere at a public meeting?—A. I made some reference to it, yes.

Q. At a public meeting?—A. At a public meeting, yes.

Q. Previous to this meeting in November?—A. Yes.

Q. But you never came out with the statement as it appears in the paper until the November meeting?—A. No.

Q. You just discussed the matter of permits generally?—A. Yes.

Q. And other general matters?—A. Relating to immigration, yes.

Q. Were those people well informed people, that you talked with?—A. I think so, yes.

Q. And people who were interested in public affairs?—A. Yes.

Q. You made a peculiar statement in your evidence—I just wish to give you an opportunity—you made a peculiar statement in your evidence; you were

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

speaking about what Mr. Forke had said about permits; he said that large numbers of them had been issued previously, and that the records of the Department would bear that out or deny it. Is that correct?—A. No, sir; I do not think I said “or deny it”.

Q. You mean the stenographer just imagined that?—A. No, I would not say that. I do not think I said that. It would not quite convey the impression I wanted to convey.

Q. It is here, on the record?

The CHAIRMAN: Would you give the page of the record?

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: It is at the bottom of page 5.

By Mr. Boys:

Q. Did you have any opportunity of revising the record?—A. I saw it just for a few moments.

Q. Was that statement in it?—A. I did not notice it.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Do you say you did not say that?—A. If the stenographer has it, I cannot very well say that I did not say it. It does not convey the impression—

Q. I am talking about what Mr. Forke said, not about impressions. Did you say yesterday that Mr. Forke said that the records of the Department would bear that out or deny it?—A. “Bear that out”, I should have said.

Q. Did you say yesterday that Mr. Forke said that the records of the Department would bear that out or deny it?—A. It was very hard, so many questions were asked me yesterday—

Q. Will you be good enough to answer my question; did you say so?—A. I think, Mr. Chairman, I have the right to answer these questions in my own way; it is not fair.

Mr. LUCAS: I would like to say here that this witness is no criminal, and he should be given a chance.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Having had all this applause, will you answer the question; I am asking you if you said yesterday that Mr. Forke said that the records of the Department would bear that out or deny it?

Mr. BOYS: He said he did not intend—

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Let him answer the question.

Mr. BOYS: You are trying to suggest that a stenographer never makes a mistake.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I am not suggesting anything of the kind, I am asking a question.

WITNESS: I think I answered that before by saying that it did not convey the impression I intended to convey.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. That does not answer my question. I asked if you said that yesterday, when you were under oath?

Mr. SPOTTON: May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN: No, Colonel Ralston has the floor.

Mr. SPOTTON: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

Mr. SPOTTON: I would like to have the privilege of asking the witness one question.

By Mr. Spotton:

Q. I would like to ask you if you were informed by the Chairman of this Committee or any person around this Committee that you had the privilege of going up and getting the stenographic report and correcting it, the same as we have?—A. No.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Will you be kind enough to answer the questions. I want to see how far you will go. I will ask again, for the fourth or fifth time, did you say yesterday that Mr. Forke said that the records of the Department would bear that out or deny it?—A. I answered that by saying that it does not convey the true meaning of what I intended to say, if I said it.

Q. Did you say that?

Mr. MCGIBBON: Mr. Chairman, this is absolutely foolish, to ask a man to repeat verbatim what he said yesterday.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I am a member of the Committee—

Mr. MCGIBBON: But you are not the whole Committee.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I want to see what this witness has to say. It is the witness who is taking up the time, I am not.

WITNESS: I will say that since it did not convey the impression, that I did not use those words.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. You say you did not say yesterday that Mr. Forke said that the records of the Department would bear that out or deny it?—A. I would say that it should be "that the records of the Department would bear that out."

Q. You cannot wiggle out in that way. I am asking you what you said.

Mr. BOYS: Are you going to permit that sort of thing, Mr. Chairman; do you think it is reasonable?

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I think this witness is fairly intelligent.

Mr. BOYS: He has given a fair and intelligent answer.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is all right.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: I am giving the witness an opportunity.

Mr. BOYS: The witness has told you what he thinks ought to be. You have no right to turn around and suggest that he is wiggling out of it. Do you think that is fair?

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Witness, I am just asking you one question, and that is, whether or not you said yesterday what is in this record at the bottom of page 5, as to what Mr. Forke told you?—A. I contend I have already answered that, sir.

Q. You contend that what you have said is an answer to the question?—A. I contend that what I have said is an answer to the question.

Q. Tell me how it was that you happened to write Mr. Forke the letter of November 27, 1927?—A. I explained that yesterday. On the 23rd of November I made the speech which is in question; on the 24th of November the report appeared in the *Regina Leader*. That was a very busy day for me. My usual work took up a lot of time, and I had a council meeting in the evening. On

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

Friday there was an important law case in the town of Indian Head, at which one of the members of this Committee was present, which took me away from home soon after six o'clock in the morning. I arrived home at eleven o'clock—

Q. That is interesting, but I do not think it is relevant?—A. I think it is. On the next day, which was Sunday, I wrote to Mr. Forke, and I pointed out to him in that letter—

Q. You did not catch my question. I asked you how it was that you came to write that letter to Mr. Forke?—A. Because this matter had now been given some publicity, and I suggested to Mr. Forke that it might be well to clean the situation up. That was the purport of my letter.

Q. The purport of your letter was, to endeavour to get Mr. Forke to clean the situation up?

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. Wasn't there something in the papers from the Minister of Immigration in reply to the statement you made; I think there is some little discrepancy there?—A. Yes. I overlooked that. On Friday, the 25th, one of the reporters of the papers called me and told me that a statement had been issued by Mr. Egan in the *Regina Post* of that date, and he asked me if I wished to reply to it. I read the statement and replied to it, I think—I am now quoting from memory—somewhat in these words, that my information is that the Minister of Immigration has the information to which I referred. That, I think, was substantially the statement I made.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. I am dealing with the letter you wrote and with your reason for writing it. My question was—I think Mr. Fansher's interjection took you away from it—

MR. FANSHER (Last Mountain): As I understand it, speaking from memory, it was in reply to the statement which was in the letter that Mr. Coldwell wrote the letter.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Let me read the first paragraph of the letter:—

You will probably note from press despatches that a great deal has been made of a statement I made at the Sons of England Hall in this city last Wednesday evening.

There is no suggestion there that you thought Mr. Forke or Mr. Egan had seen it; you were giving them news?—A. No, sir. Later on in the letter I said I was enclosing newspaper clippings. The newspaper clippings I sent were those from the *Regina Post* of the Friday afternoon.

Q. Yes; apparently you did not know that Mr. Forke knew anything about it?—A. No.

Q. And in this letter you suggest that, in the second paragraph:—

In the course of an address on Immigration I made the suggestion that at times during the past few years when the officials were placing bars against certain classes of immigrants, permits were given to those who found difficulty in getting in, for a fee, and that, to the credit of the present minister it should be stated, this had been stopped.

Do you think—you seem to be careful about words—do you think the word "suggestion" was a correct word to convey there; do you think that would convey what you had done?—A. I think so.

Q. You thought the newspaper article was correct?—A. I said it was substantially correct, in so far as the words attributed to me were concerned, but the heading was wrong. I never made any charges.

Q. No. (Reads):—

I am not stating what I do not know to be an absolute fact. It is not hearsay, it is not guesswork. I got that possibly from the highest source in Canada on immigration affairs. These permits were sold, and the bars were let down and people were allowed to flow in who were not ordinarily eligible for our immigration.

That is what you call a suggestion?—A. Yes, that might be termed a suggestion.

Q. All right, that is your idea of it. Why did you go out of your way in the letter to mention to Mr. Forke the fact that his conversation was not confidential; who had suggested that it was confidential?—A. No one.

Q. Why did you take the trouble to put a whole paragraph in saying that it was not confidential?—A. I don't know. I had no particular reason for it, I just did it that way.

Q. You just inserted that without any reason at all?—A. Yes, certainly.

Q. May I suggest that perhaps your conscience was troubling you a little and that you realized that it was a confidential conversation, and that you wrote this letter to square yourself?—A. In this regard my conscience has never worried me.

Q. Get back to the point; was it not the fact that your conscience was troubling you about the fact that you had spilled a personal and private conversation, and that you were trying to square yourself?—A. It was not troubling me, nor was I trying to square myself.

Q. Will you give me an answer to the question; why did you go to the trouble of writing a whole paragraph to demonstrate that this conversation was not a confidential conversation?—A. I can give you no reason other than I have given.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. When you had the conversation with Mr. Forke, did he intimate at that time in any way, shape or form that you were to regard what had passed as confidential?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. Boys:

Q I was not here, Mr. Coldwell, but I heard the statement of what you said, in which you mentioned Dr. Manion's name. Had you any right to mention Dr. Manion's name?—A. If you will look at the record you will see that I was asked, who was the Minister of Immigration before Mr. Forke? I did not positively know, but I think in a more or less questioning manner I suggested Dr. Manion's name. I am sorry I did that.

Q. After having considered the matter, do you say that Dr. Manion's name was mentioned in the conversation?—A. I made it clear yesterday that Dr. Manion's name was not mentioned by Mr. Forke.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. And so stated it yesterday?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. You simply designated him as his predecessor?—A. Yes, I was asked the question.

By Hon. Mr. Ralston:

Q. Have you found out who his predecessor was?—A. I have not even looked into it.

Q. And you do not know?—A. I do not know.

[Mr. M. J. Coldwell.]

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions of the witness? Is it the wish of the Committee to discharge the witness? Very well, Mr. Coldwell, you are discharged.

Witness discharged.

The CHAIRMAN: I have a letter here from M. Owen Culshaw, on behalf of the Salvation Army, who was a witness here a few days ago, which reads as follows:—

A. A. FRASER, Esq.,
Clerk to the Committee,
Agriculture and Colonization,
Ottawa, Ont.

*Re Mr. Spotton's Question on Medical and Civil Examination
in Great Britain*

DEAR SIR,—As desired by the Chairman of the Committee, I beg to send herewith the correspondence which has now reached me in regard to Flora MacDowall. I have already written you in regard to the mistake I made in giving the girl's weight as 150 pounds instead of fifteen stone, but I wish to make it quite clear that was not the point I was endeavouring to make when giving the illustration of Flora MacDowall to the Committee. It will be recalled that the point at issue was that this girl had passed the medical test and her card issued. She was only stopped coming to Canada by the fact that she was denied the Reduced Passage. *If she had been in a position to pay her ordinary passage she could have gone to any Steamship Agent, booked her passage and come to Canada.*

It will be seen, from the Medical Identity Card sent herewith, that Miss MacDowall passed by the doctor on the 17th February, but it was not until the 6th March the girl was told she was certified under Section 3 subsection "C", ample time for her to have sailed for Canada if she had been in a financial position to do so.

My attention has been called to the statement made in the *Toronto Star* of Saturday, to the effect that the girl was certified three "C" owing to marked obesity and stunted height, and because of her obesity is decidedly unemployable. If this is the reason then (1) according to the **regulations governing the issue of Medical Cards**, the doctor should have retained the card and not give it back to the girl, and (2) if the girl is decidedly unemployable why is she approved by the Director (see endorsement on back of Certificate) to come to Canada as a full paying passenger.

I leave the members of the Committee to judge if my statement is a "gross misrepresentation of the facts", as stated in the *Toronto Star* referred to. In view of all that has transpired in this particular case I should be obliged if this letter could be included with my statement.

I am, sir,

Yours faithfully,

M. OWEN CULSHAW.

Staff Captain.

P.S.—It would be esteemed if the correspondence could be returned after the Committee have finished with the same.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, CANADA

This Certificate must be presented at the Canadian Port of Entry

Serial Number, 16-272. Age 27.

Name, Flora L. McDowall.

Nationality, British. Sex, F.

Signature of Bearer, Flora L. B. McDowall.

H. P. GOUTHRO,

Signature of Medical Examiner.

Place of Examination, Glasgow.

This Certificate is valid only for four months from date of issue to date of Embarkation.

PHOTOGRAPH

Approved.

J. BRUCE WALKER,

Director.

107, HOPE STREET, GLASGOW, C.2,

6th March, 1928.

DEAR MADAM,—We regret to inform you that as our Medical Adviser has certified you under Section 3 ss. (c) of the Immigration Act, we will therefore be unable to accept you for the reduced fare.

Will you please return your Identity Card to this Office at your earliest convenience, when your references will be forwarded to you.

Yours faithfully,

JAMES L. MALCOLM,

Canadian Government Emigration Agent.

Miss FLORA McDOWALL,

218 Dumbarton Road,

Patrick,

Glasgow,

107, HOPE STREET, GLASGOW, C.2,

16th March, 1928.

Major H. SPICER,

Glasgow.

DEAR SIR:

Your Ref. ae—G. 7884 Flora L. McDowall

For your information please be advised that our Director states distinctly that this girl cannot be considered under the Reduced Fare, and he asks that you obtain from her the Identity Card and forward it to this Office at once so that we may send it on.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

JAMES L. MALCOLM,

Canadian Government Emigration Agent.

MONDAY, 12th March, 1928.

Dear Mr. BRUCE WALKER,—My attention has been called to the case of Miss Flora McDowall, and particularly to a copy of a letter from your Glasgow Agent to Miss McDowall, dated 6th March. The purport is not quite clear to me.

On the 17th February, this girl presented herself to the Medical Officer in Glasgow, and was duly passed, her Identity Card signed, stamped, and handed back to her, testifying to the fact that she was a suitable person to enter Canada. Then comes your Agent's letter of the 6th March, stating that the Medical Officer had certified her under Section ss. (c) of the Immigration Act, and asking her to return the Card of Identity.

Surely there is a mistake somewhere, and I would appreciate it if you would look into the case, and advise me further.

Yours faithfully,

D. C. LAMB,
Commissioner.

J. BRUCE WALKER, Esq.,
Director of Migration,
The Canadian Building,
Trafalgar Square,
S.W. 1.

THE CANADIAN BUILDING, TRAFALGAR SQUARE, LONDON, S.W. 1.

13th March, 1928.

Dear COMMISSIONER LAMB,—

Dealing with your letter—G. 7884—of the 12th March, Miss Flora L. B. McDowall was certified under Sec. 3 ss. (c) of the Immigration Act and was asked to return her Card of Identity because she was certified. The cause of her rejection, however, was that she stands 5 ft. 4 ins. in height, is 27 years of age, and weighs the stupendous total of 210 lbs. She is not the kind of material that we could *honestly encourage to proceed to Canada under the Empire Settlement Act, though no objection would be taken to her going forward if she paid her own fare.*

Yours faithfully,

J. BRUCE WALKER,
Director

Commissioner DAVID C. LAMB,
The Salvation Army,
Migration House,
3, Upper Thames Street,
London, E.C. 4

Saturday,

17th March, 1928.

Dear Mr. BRUCE WALKER:

Flora L. B. McDowall—18.M.5997

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 13th instant, *re* the above named, and note what you say.

The Salvation Army does not at present contemplate advancing the full passage money, but it is possible the girl's friends may be able to find the amount, in which case we presume it will be in order for her to proceed?

Yours truly,

D. C. LAMB,
Commissioner.

J. BRUCE WALKER, Esq.,
Director of European Migration to Canada,
The Canadian Building,
Trafalgar Square,
S.W. 1.

Saturday,

17th March, 1928.

Dear Mr. PLANT:

Flora L. B. McDowall—G 7884

I think the enclosed will be of interest to you—the underlining is ours.

Yours truly,

D. C. LAMB,
Commissioner.

G. F. PLANT, Esq.,
Oversea Settlement Department,
Caxton House,
Tothill Street,
S.W. 1.

OVERSEA SETTLEMENT DEPARTMENT, DOMINIONS OFFICE, CAXTON HOUSE,
TOTHILL STREET, LONDON, S.W. 1

March 21, 1928.

Personal.

Dear COMMISSIONER LAMB,—I have received your letter of the 17th March regarding the case of Miss McDowall. I am rather surprised that the Medical Officer should have passed this girl in the first instance. It is not every employer who would be prepared to take on such a giantess.

Yours sincerely,

G. F. PLANT,

Commissioner DAVID C. LAMB,
Salvation Army.

az.
G. 7884.

4th April, 1928.

J. BRUCE WALKER, Esq.,
Director of European Migration to Canada,
The Canadian Building,
Trafalgar Square, S.W. 1.

DEAR MR. BRUCE WALKER:

Flora L. B. McDowall.—18.M.5997

I beg to refer to my letter of the 17th March in respect to the above named to which I do not appear to have had a reply. In order that I may be in a position to advise this girl's friends I shall be pleased to hear from you in respect to the last paragraph.

Yours faithfully,

D. C. LAMB,
Commissioner.

ET/BR
18 M. 5997

THE CANADIAN BUILDING,
TRAFALGAR SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.1.
5th April, 1928.

DEAR SIR,—I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, reference az.G.7884, in the case of *Flora L. B. McDowall*.

For a reply to the second paragraph of your letter of the 17th March, I would refer you to the last sentence of the Director's letter to you dated March 13th.

I shall be glad if you will instruct whoever is holding the Identity Card in this case that *it is to be returned* to this Office without further delay. Miss McDowall is certifiable under the Immigration Act, and her card *must be endorsed by the Director* before she may be permitted to go forward.

Yours faithfully,

ANDREW ??????

Assistant Director.

Commissioner DAVID C. LAMB,
The Salvation Army,
3, Upper Thames Street,
London, E.C. 4.

ANDREW KELLY, Esq.,
The Canadian Building,
Trafalgar Square,
London, S.W. 1.

12th April, 1928.

DEAR SIR,—I am directed by Commissioner Lamb to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 5th April in respect to Miss Flora McDowall (18.M.5997.3, and to send herewith Identity Card for the Director's endorsement. I shall be much obliged if you will return this to me as soon as possible.

Yours faithfully,

(M. OWEN CULSHAW)
Branch Manager.

ET/BR

THE CANADIAN BUILDING,
TRAFALGAR SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.1.

16th April, 1928.

DEAR SIR:

Your reference G. 7884 az. Flora McDowall

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 12th instant, and am returning herewith Card of Identity, duly endorsed by the Director, for the above woman, who has been certified under Section 3 ss. (c) of the Immigration Act.

Yours faithfully,

ANDREW O'KELLY,
Assistant Director.

Major M. OWEN CULSHAW,
The Salvation Army,
3, Upper Thames Street, E.C. 4.

az.

17th April, 1928.

ANDREW O'KELLY, Esq.,
The Canadian Building,
Trafalgar Square,
London, S.W. 1.

DEAR SIR:

Re Flora McDowall (18.M.5997)

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16th April and thank you for returning the Card of Identity duly endorsed by the Director.

Yours faithfully,

(M. OWEN CULSHAW)
Branch Manager.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you wish this correspondence to go on the record?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I will so move, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by Mr. Edwards that the correspondence just read be placed on the records of the Committee. What is your pleasure?

I declare the motion carried.

What procedure will be next?

Mr. COOTE: We may as well adjourn. We have to go to the House anyway.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Forke desires to make a statement, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. FORKE (Minister of Immigration and Colonization) called and sworn.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I have a statement here which I will read to the Committee. (Reads):—

"I first met Mr. Coldwell in Regina, during the election campaign of 1925. At that time I was House Leader of the Progressive Party. Mr. Coldwell was a candidate. I was in Regina to speak in support of

[Hon. Mr. Forke.]

his candidature. He met me previous to the meeting and arranged that I should address the Normal and High Schools. He went with me to the schools, and introduced me to several of the teachers in both schools. I may say he was unable to be with me later in the day when I addressed the schools. As I was there to speak in his support as a candidate, before I went to the schools we spent some time in a private talk concerning the situation in Regina, and particularly regarding his own candidature.

"That night, I addressed a meeting in his interests, with Mr. Coldwell on the platform. He also spoke.

"He was defeated, and he wrote me after the election was over—as far as my recollection goes—thanking me for services I had rendered. I replied to this. The communications were of an entirely friendly character.

"The next time I saw him was in Ottawa some time last spring—about a year ago.

"Mr. Coldwell called at my office, and he then made some explanation in regard to a gentleman who had come down from Regina with a letter of introduction to myself from him. He explained to me that he had no connection with the request that the gentleman made for permits. He also informed me that when the gentleman returned to Regina, he stated that he was unable to do anything with me, and I had refused to grant him any permits. Mr. Coldwell seemed anxious for me to understand that he had no connection with the request for those permits, and was anxious to make this plain to me so that I would get no false impressions, in order that he might reinstate himself in my estimation.

"This led to a few general remarks with regard to the question of issuing of permits, in which as a matter of fact, Mr. Coldwell took perhaps a larger part than I did. The fact that he was so anxious to dissociate himself from any connection with his friend who was seeking the permits, taken with what he said, led me to believe that he knew something of rumors which had been current with regard to the issuing of permits. The conversation was back and forth, not a consecutive statement by either one, as given by the witness in his evidence.

"I gave him some idea of the difficulties in regard to the issuing of permits, and expressed my dislike of that part of my duties which required me to take the responsibility of dealing with these applications. I expressed my desire that there be nothing in connection with my conduct of affairs that would not be absolutely correct.

Regarding Mr. Coldwell's statement about my telling him I had checked up the records of the Department regarding the number of permits issued by my predecessors, and that I said I wrote my predecessor and that he wrote his predecessor—I might explain here that Sir Henry Drayton was my predecessor—I want to say very positively, that if Mr. Coldwell got this information at all, he did not get it from me. At no time did I ever examine or check up the previous records of the Department in regard to the number of permits issued by my predecessor. I have no knowledge of the number of permits issued by them, and I did not write to my predecessor in connection with the number of permits which he had issued.

"In connection with refusing Mr. Coldwell's friend, I cited to Mr. Coldwell a case where a gentleman had come in—a young lawyer—who was not a Member of Parliament nor had ever been in the House. He had a large number of permits. I felt rather annoyed, and just shouted the question across the table—"How much do you get for these permits"

—and without a moment's hesitation, he said "\$100." I said—do you imagine that I am so simple that I am going to hand you out permits in the way you imagine it can be done? I refused to give them to him. I told Mr. Coldwell that.

"I can also state emphatically that I did not make any of the statements which Mr. Coldwell says I made about Mr. McMurray. Mr. McMurray's election was in 1925, two years before I came into the Department, and I knew nothing about Mr. McMurray's transactions with the Department, if any took place, and since I came into the Department I have had no dealings with Mr. McMurray, directly or indirectly.

"In reference to the statement about my becoming a millionaire—that was, of course, not said seriously. It just came out of what had been said about the young lawyer and the \$100 fee.

"I can say that the only thing I said from which Mr. Coldwell could get the impression that money was being received improperly, was what I told him about the lawyer.

"In reference to any conversation about general trafficking in permits—when I came into the Department, I knew nothing about it whatever, but very soon after I came in, this case came up where this young man admitted to me that he was getting \$100 for each permit, and that put me on my guard and perhaps made me suspicious of all applications in large numbers. I had no knowledge whatever, that there was any general trafficking, but I just thought if this young man could get \$100 for these permits, why might it not be that other people who were applying, could do the same thing. That was the only idea I had of general trafficking, and it was in this connection that I was explaining to Mr. Coldwell how careful I had to be. I can say now, that I had no knowledge, by admission or otherwise, of any other case but this one, in which money was being received for permits."

That, Mr. Chairman, is the statement that I have prepared this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN: Any questions?

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Mr. Forke, would you please explain just a little more clearly with regard to the circumstances under which the young lawyer of whom you spoke came to you? Did he have permits in his possession or were they applications for permits which he had?—A. Mr. Chairman, I will probably be asked what was the name of this young man.

Q. No, I am not questioning you about that.—A. They were applications for permits.

Q. Were they applications which he was presenting to you and which you refused?—A. Yes.

Q. So that you granted no permits to this young man who made the application?—A. No.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. Did he lead you to believe that he had got other applications filled out previously to his coming to you?—A. No. I might say that I do not think he had, or he would not have made such a frank admission as he did make.

Q. How then, did you get the idea from him that these permits were worth \$100 to him?—A. He told me so.

Q. Must he not have been securing permits in some manner or other at some time in order to know the value of them?—A. I cannot say. That is his own affair.

[Hon. Mr. Forke.]

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Mr. Forke, just one other question. With respect to Mr. McMurray, did you say anything to the previous witness with regard to Mr. McMurray securing money by the use of permits for electioneering purposes? Did Mr. McMurray's past or expected election expenses come into the conversation which you had?—A. I made no statement of that kind. I am absolutely certain that I know nothing about Mr. McMurray's affairs.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. Was Mr. McMurray's election mentioned at all in that interview?—A. Not according to my recollection.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Mr. Forke, since you have been Minister of your Department, has it come to your knowledge that permits were being sold or used for the purpose of securing compensation to those who assisted the applicants in making applications?—A. I have no knowledge whatever of any one getting a dollar for permits; no positive knowledge. I have, like the rest of you, read paragraphs in the newspapers which made that statement, but I have no proof whatever. In fact the longer I am in the Department and the more stories I read in the newspapers, the less confidence do I place in the rumours that I read, because I know so many of them that I see are false, and not true.

Q. One other question, Mr. Forke. Since you have been administering your Department, have charges been preferred to you to the effect that any employees or officials of your Department were implicated in the improper issue of permits?—A. No, Mr. Cahan, I have never had a breath of suspicion against any of my officials. I am happy to answer any question that I possibly can.

By Mr. Jacobs:

Q. No official in your Department can issue a permit, can he?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. I thought they had to be issued by the Deputy Minister.—A. Well, I referred to the Deputy Minister when you said, "any official."

Q. Outside the Deputy Minister?—A. No.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. No person outside of the Deputy Minister can issue a permit?—A. I suppose the Assistant Deputy may sign them when the Deputy is not there.

Q. And the Divisional Secretary?—A. I am not aware of them issuing any permits. I do not think they can. It is only the Minister and his Deputies who have the power to issue permits.

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. Mr. Forke, Mr. Coldwell has stated that in his conversation with you, a defeated candidate in the Maritime Provinces was mentioned. Do you recall any such references?—A. No, I do not recall that incident at all. I do not know anyone from the Maritime Provinces or any other place whom I can remember. I can remember members of Parliament and defeated members who have asked me for a permit, or two or three permits for their constituents, but I have no recollection of any statement of that kind.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Can your Deputy issue permits without your knowledge, or do you have to O.K. and pass the applications?—A. No, I have not O.K'd them. I have made regulations and rules that he has to follow in the issuing of these permits. I may say I do not think I have ever signed a permit since I went into the Department. They are all done by the Deputy Minister under my instructions and regulations.

[Hon. Mr. Forke.]

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. Is it not a fact that Canada is divided into four different districts with a Commissioner in charge of each, and is it not a fact that each of those Commissioners may issue a permit without your knowledge?—A. I have not understood that it was done. I have always understood that the Deputy Minister has issued those permits.

Q. Are you sure the Commissioners have not issued any?—A. It never entered my head that they could do so.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. Would it be contrary to the regulations?—A. I think it would be contrary to the regulations. The Minister issues the permits and I would say that only his Deputies can do so.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. The previous witness just stated that you had sent a letter to your predecessor, and your predecessor had written back referring you to his predecessor. Have you anything to say about that?—A. After I came into the Department, I had a letter from Sir Henry Drayton, to which I replied, which did not refer to any previous permits that had been issued. That is the only communication. I do not know what was meant by writing to my predecessor and then my predecessor writing to his predecessor. That is all strange to me. I did not understand it. The letter I got from Sir Henry Drayton, I replied to it.

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. Might we have this letter?—A. I am very sorry to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have the reply to the letter but I have not got the letter itself; and I did not want to bring the reply to the letter before the Committee because I thought the question would be immediately asked: "Why did you not bring the letter?" I asked for the correspondence in my Department this morning, and, strange to say, they were able to give me my reply, but they were unable to find Sir Henry Drayton's letter.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Did it refer to permits?—A. It referred to permits. If I had had Sir Henry's I would have produced both letters. I have only got the reply. I can read the reply, but in fact I have not got it here with me. I may find it.

By Mr. Coote:

Q. Will you make a search for it?—A. I may find it. It might have disappeared off the files.

The CHAIRMAN: Any more questions?

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, I would like some more information about permits, but I feel that it can be got better from the Deputy Minister, and perhaps Mr. Forke will agree that if any question comes up, regarding the permits, which may arise out of the evidence we get from Mr. Regan, that we may get answers from him. As far as I am concerned I do not wish to ask any questions now.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Forke will always be available when the Committee is sitting.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Always.

Mr. FANSHER: I would like to see that reply which Mr. Forke has just spoken of, at some part of the evidence, with the hope that we can get the copy of both letters.

[Hon. Mr. Forke.]

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I submit with all deference that if we have one we should have both, in all fairness.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: That was my own impression.

Mr. FANSHER: I think we should have both.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: And we should not have the one without the other.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: You will have a search made, Mr. Forke?

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Yes, I will have a search made. I have got the reply and there was a notation on the edge of the reply that I got, that the original letter had gone astray. The phrase used is "had not been returned". I cannot understand that myself, why it should not have been there.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Was the letter personal or official?—A. I would call it a personal letter, Mr. Cahan, from my recollection. I think it would be a personal letter. It was entirely a matter between Sir Henry Drayton and myself.

Q. And, do you say the correspondence was initialed by Sir Henry Drayton, a letter to you and you made reply to Sir Henry Drayton?—A. Yes, that is so.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards:

Q. Was there anything in your conversation with Mr. Coldwell, or was it said, that you would wish him to regard it as confidential?—A. I have only to say that I was very much astonished when I saw the use he had made of the conversation with me. I never expected it would be used, any of it. It all came up through Mr. Coldwell's explanation to me about the friend he had sent down to seek permits, or probably permits would never have been mentioned.

Q. According to your statement, the statement made by Mr. Coldwell did not take place at all. Now, was there anything that you said that you would not be prepared to say anywhere to any person; did you express yourself to him in a way that you would not have expressed yourself to another person?—A. Unless I had been called upon to give evidence, I do not know, if I had been expressing exactly what I have admitted I said to Mr. Coldwell, there was nothing particularly that I can recollect that could not have been said anywhere; but at the same time, when you have a private conversation with a friend it puts a minister in a rather difficult position if he thinks at any moment any private conversation he may make will immediately be made public on the platform. It is rather a difficult position, and although there was nothing in the conversation that could not be made public, at the same time, I did not think it was a proper action on the part of Mr. Coldwell to repeat what he considered to have been said to him in private, on a public platform; and which I never said—a great deal of it.

By Mr. Millar:

Q. You considered the conversation with Mr. Coldwell a private one?—A. I certainly did—a conversation between two friends.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Listening very carefully to your statement, and presuming it to be absolutely correct, I was unable to see why Hon. Mr. Ralston seemed to press that particular part of the conversation as being confidential. I cannot gather from what you said any reason why it should be confidential or why it should be regarded as such.

The WITNESS: I might explain that the whole thing hinged on that \$100 being mentioned by that young lawyer who came to get permits. I think I said in my statement that I discussed with him the difficulties of my position.

[Hon. Mr. Forke.]

I felt the responsibility; in fact, I did not like that part of the responsibility which was perhaps legitimately mine, but I think I have stated quite definitely the salient points of the conversation with Mr. Coldwell. In his evidence, whenever he mentioned that part about a million dollars, for instance, I knew at once that that was correct—that I had said that; when he said something about a \$100 fee for a permit I immediately recollected the conversation with the young lawyer, but as to these other parts, I have no recollection of ever having heard those remarks and I am inclined to believe he has mixed them up with some other remarks than in the conversation he had with me.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. I think you admitted this young lawyer did come to your office asking to have a number of permits signed?—A. Yes.

Q. And he said these permits were worth \$100 to him?—A. Yes.

Q. After he had made that statement did you take any step to find out whether this sort of thing was going on or not?—A. I thought \$100 was a pretty heavy fee, but I never considered there was anything essentially wrong in a lawyer coming on behalf of a client and taking a reasonable fee for doing so. It is quite common. Unfortunately, a great many people seem to think that nothing can be done without a lawyer. When they want a particular favour they go and interview a lawyer. On the other hand, if they came to the Department and stated their case they would have a better chance than by getting a lawyer to do it for them.

By Mr. Garland (Bow River):

Q. I would like to ask if as a result of your experience you do not think it would be a good thing to have stamped on the face of all permits a message in red or any other attractive colour that "this permit is not exchangeable for cash" or words to that effect?—A. Mr. Chairman, it may seem rather amusing, but that has been seriously discussed, to see if we could adopt some method whereby a client who wanted a permit would know it would not cost him any more than the fee allowed by law. I have discussed that with my officials, but as yet we have not been able to come to any definite arrangement.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. When a permit is issued do you deliver it to the lawyer who has made the application, or do you, through your agents, deliver the permits directly to the person who is entitled to it after it is issued?—A. My deputy has always done that himself, but I expect the lawyer who makes the application will get the permits for delivery to his clients.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Mr. Forke, have there been many such instances as that young lawyer—has any person applied for a large number of permits?—A. No, I do not think since I came into the Department that any single individual has applied for a large number of permits. They have been held down to a limited number.

Q. But has the application been made?—A. I may say that a good many more applications have been made than have been granted.

Q. I do not think you quite grasp my point. Has any individual come to you asking for fifty or seventy-five or a hundred permits, such as the young lawyer whom you mentioned?—A. No. I think that was the only case where a large number was asked for by one man.

[Hon. Mr. Forke.]

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Was there only one lawyer who came to you? Have you had a number of lawyers coming to you with applications for permits? I want to know if that is a general practice with lawyers?—A. Well, we have had a few.

Q. You have not had many doctors coming, have you?—A. (No audible answer.)

By Mr. Fansher (Last Mountain):

Q. You say you have had "a few"? Does that mean three or four, or a larger number?—A. Well, I would not say there was a large number, but there was a considerable number. They come down from Toronto and up from Montreal, and we have one or two in Ottawa, but there was not really any large number.

Q. Have you had any from the West?—A. They do not come to see me as a rule. The only time I see them is when my deputy has turned them down, and they think they have a better chance by seeing me, and they come and see me and tell me about the deputy being too hard-hearted, and having no consideration.

There is another kind of permit. Sometimes the deputy has some doubt as to whether or not a permit should be issued, and he will then consult with me, but the general run are issued by my deputy. The applicants go and see the deputy. They do not come to see me at all. My deputy **knows the rules and regulations** as to what shall be done. I see very few of them excepting the troublesome kind, which I do not want to see at all.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. How many permits have been issued since you assumed the administration of the Department?—A. I cannot say, but that can be had quite easily.

Q. They have all been laid on the table of the House?—A. No. I may explain that a little bit. Section 4 of the Immigration Act speaks about the issue of permits. These are permits of one kind, but these we are discussing here are really what we call "Letters of Admittance." A permit is only for a stated period of six months or a year at the most. These others, which we have commonly called "permits," are really letters of admittance given under P.C. 183 which states that when the Minister is convinced that any labour is required in Canada which is needed by the applicant, the Minister may then issue a permit or entrance to come into the country. These are the ones spoken of commonly as permits. When a man gets one of those he has landed, he is in the country as an immigrant and in quite a different position to a man coming in under section 4 of the Immigration Act.

Q. A list of permits is laid upon the table of the House within a certain period after the House meets?—A. Yes.

Q. Those are called "permits"; are they not?—A. Yes.

Q. But those are not the permits which are being spoken of to-day before the Committee?—A. No.

Q. There are a number outside of that, altogether?—A. Yes.

Q. Which you now term "letters of admittance"?—A. Yes, that is really what they would be.

By Mr. Carmichael:

Q. Is this letter of admittance in a particular form or might it be any letters written in any form covering that point?—A. It is in the form that it is admitted under P.C. 183 of the Immigration Act.

Q. Is there a printed document?—A. I suppose it is a printed document.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): As a matter of fact it is a printed document.

The WITNESS: I have never seen one.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I have.

The WITNESS: I may say that some people imagine that everything in connection with permits is altogether wrong. When you take into consideration the situation as it exists to-day on the Continent of Europe where no one is supposed to come into Canada to stay in Canada, unless they are agricultural labourers or domestic servants, and where you have the whole continent to deal with—although we have certain preferred countries to which we have granted more latitude, but also have the non-preferred countries from where no individual outside of those classes can come into Canada—it is a rather difficult matter. I want to make this plain to show that permits are perfectly legitimate under certain circumstances. Perhaps, we will say, a man wants to do some particular work, and can employ here no other nationality than Canadian, and is very anxious to get someone in to do some particular work; he has a place for him; he needs him; and cannot find the kind of man he wants at his door, and he makes an application to bring in some particular man for that job; he usually gets the permit if he makes a good case. That is what I call a legitimate permit.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. That is your letter of admittance?—A. That is our letter of admittance. We have other cases—and I want to appeal to the humanity of the audience in a way—where, for instance, a wealthy man in Toronto or Montreal is carrying on a big business, and perhaps may be a friend of my friend Mr. Jacobs—he may be a Jew—who has some poor relative over in Europe who is persecuted and suffering a great deal, some young man. He says, “If I could get that young man over here I would place him in my business; it would be well for me; it would be well for him; can not I obtain a permit to bring that young man over to assist me?” The reply to that often is, “There is plenty of help in Canada; you can get all the help you want here,” and he says, “This is a particular friend of mine, he is under very bad conditions where he is, he is suffering greatly,” and the applicant usually obtains the permit. So many people think when they hear of a “permit” that there is money behind it. There may be in some cases, but outside of lawyers’ fees I do not believe there is much money in permits.

Q. That permit would be issued under P.C. 183?—A. Yes. It is an Order in Council, No. 183.

The witness retired.

The Committee adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, May 22, 1928.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock, a.m., the Chairman, Mr. W. F. Kay, presiding.

Hon. E. J. McMURRAY called and sworn.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee: I was astounded and stunned to read in the Winnipeg papers a statement made by a gentleman by the name of Coldwell, from Regina, to your Committee here to the effect that he had been informed that I had received a large number of permits and that they had been sold at \$100 apiece, and that the moneys had been used in connection with election purposes. I repudiated that statement in forceful language, but not half as forceably as I felt. I denied it absolutely and I welcomed the opportunity of coming before the Committee here and endeavouring to clear away any charge of that nature. Unfortunately a charge preferred against a public man like that, even if he does clear it away, is like a man attacked by a foul and loathsome beast; there is still some slime left on him, and that is the position I am in. I was glad to read the denial of the Hon. Minister of Immigration. What he has said is absolutely true. I have had no dealings with Hon. Mr. Forke, in any manner, directly or indirectly, since he has been in office.

Now, to outline the situation. I was elected in 1921 for the cosmopolitan constituency of North Winnipeg. About half of that constituency is English and Canadian born, and the other half of foreign born extraction. Shortly after I was elected, a number of people came to me and wanted to bring their blood relations and near connections to this country. At that time I assisted them as well as I could. I have no record of what was done. I inaugurated none of it. I never charged them a cent. Shortly after their coming, they crowded in so much on me that I charged them telegraph costs and this, that and the other. Then I turned them completely away from my office. Even in a legal way, I would not handle the work. I could not handle it in the position I was in.

Now, I had a law firm at that time which continued for one year and looking over the records of the firm I find there was handled some seven applications, handled in a strictly legal way. They were handled by my firm when I was not there, and legal fees were charged. Any lawyer in this Committee will, I think, say these were reasonable and proper.

By Mr. Lucas:

Q. What year was that, did you say?—A. 1922—in the latter part of 1922. The first application was granted and a legal fee was charged of \$50 in that case. The next case was refused and a legal fee of \$25 was charged. The next case was granted and a legal fee of \$25 was charged. The next case was partially granted and partially refused—it was in connection with three people—and a legal fee of \$15 was charged. The next case was granted and a legal fee of \$25 was charged. The next case was granted and a legal fee of \$25 was charged, and the last application was refused and a legal fee of \$35 was charged.

[Hon. E. J. McMurray.]

Since I went back to Winnipeg I have had no further connection with that law firm. I retired from the firm. Since I returned to Winnipeg, in the years 1926, '27 and '28 I have handled four cases, none of which came to the department here, but were handled through Mr. Gellay of Winnipeg. The first was the case of an Italian by the name of Cassegrande, and a legal fee of \$25 was charged. Another case was that of Joe Manzo. The application had been made through another lawyer and then Manzo came to me. There had been some difficulty—I forget what it was,—and I charged him a fee of \$25. The next case was that of a former resident of Canada who had gone to Chicago, and on his attempting to return was held up at the boundary at Emerson. Through Mr. Gellay this man was permitted to come into Canada. He had resided in Canada for some seventeen or eighteen years and it was really a hardship to bar his returning. In this case a fee of \$25 was charged. The last one was made in this year, 1928, and a charge of \$25 was made. Since I have been back in Winnipeg I have handled these four cases in three years.

When I was down here as a member, applications would be made to me—and I suppose many other Members possibly had the same thing to deal with—by different people. Sometimes a lawyer would write me or wire me to see if I could help to get it through; sometimes the people themselves would communicate with me. There were a number of them, I do not know how many—possibly 25 or 30 altogether—over a term of years. I was here for four or five years. For these no charges were made of any kind whatsoever.

Now, I do not know how it strikes you gentlemen, but the charges of a man against a man like myself in the constituency I was in, running for Parliament, of going out and getting these permits and charging the people, his own constituents, \$100 apiece for them—I would think a man who did that would be an utter fool because he certainly was inviting disaster, and would be destroyed.

Now, apart altogether from my own poor qualities, one of the reasons for my defeat in the cosmopolitan constituency of North Winnipeg was this very thing, that permits were not sufficiently granted to these people. I must say this of the Department, and particularly of my friend Mr. Egan, that he and I did not get along on the subject at all. He watched that Department like a watch-dog. The applications that I did make, and which were refused, I consider never should have been refused.

Now, that is the general statement, Mr. Chairman. I have had some ups and downs in political life, as many of you know, but I never had anything that cut as deep as this did, and the remarks of Mr. Coldwell, a man whom I never heard of, and never saw, I cannot understand at all. I do protest on this occasion—and I think you will bear with me while I file a protest—against scandalizing men in public life—

Several MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

The WITNESS: Ordinarily bull-baiting for Spanish amusement is a comparatively innocent and mild performance to that of badgering a man who takes the responsibility of acting on behalf of his country in a public way. I may be stepping out of my place in making this protest, but I consider a burglar a gentleman compared to a scandal-monger who endeavours to take a man's reputation away from him.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. You referred to so many cases. I assume you meant individuals? A "case" would not be a man representing a family?—A. Occasionally they represented two or three. Sometimes an application was made for a man and his children; sometimes a man made an application to have his children brought over. They varied.

[Hon. E. J. McMurray.]

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Mr. McMurray, when you were a member of the law firm, who were the other members of the firm?—A. The other members of the firm were John W. Wilton, S. W. McMurray, J. L. Lamonte and Samuel Portigal.

Q. And the name of this firm was—A. Wilton, McMurray, Lamonte, Portigal and McMurray—or to that effect.

Q. You were practising as a law firm in the city of Winnipeg?—A. Yes.

Q. And were so practising when you were elected to Parliament in 1921?—A. Yes.

Q. And remained a member of that firm for one year?—A. For one year.

Q. After that you practised alone?—A. No. I quit the law practice altogether, Mr. Cahan.

Q. In 1922?—A. Toward the end of 1922. I had no further interest there.

Q. When did you become the Solicitor General of Canada?—A. I think it was in September, 1923.

Q. And you were not practising between 1922 and the early part of 1923?—A. No.

Q. After 1923 did you enter the firm again?—A. No. When I was through here I went back to Winnipeg and started up for myself.

Q. How long were you the Solicitor General of Canada?—A. From September, 1923, to May, 1925.

Q. In regard to the applications for permission to enter—we have called them in this inquiry “applications for admission” to distinguish them from permits which are issued under section 4 of the Act—of these applications for admission or permits, so-called, have you given us the complete list of those made by you or by members of the firm with which you were associated?—A. I have given you a complete list. I did not give you the number; I said about thirty which I handled when I was down here, gratuitously. I do not know where they originated. The other is a complete list handled by the firm with which I was associated.

Q. Of the thirty, approximately, in which you became interested during the time you were a Member of Parliament, did you receive any solatium or fee in connection with those?—A. Absolutely none.

Q. So that the payments for legal services made by you or your firm are covered by the statement you have already made to this Committee?—A. Yes, absolutely.

Q. Now, just to clear up any suspicion. Do you know the firm of Kolchin and Boxer, furriers, of Winnipeg?—A. I know of the firm.

Q. Do you know S. Kolchin of that firm?—A. I may have met Kolchin. I think he has done some work for my wife in connection with his line of work, but I do not recall the gentleman at all, although his name is familiar to me.

Q. Is his name included in the list which you have before you of those who made application through your firm, for the admission of his brother?—A. Not amongst those for which any charge was made, Mr. Cahan; it is not on the list here.

Q. I am instructed that an application was made by him and that the permits were refused and then you say positively that S. Kolchin of Kolchin & Boxer, furriers, of Winnipeg, did not pay to you or to one J. W. Wilton the sum of \$100 for services rendered in making application for the permits?—A. I will say that he never paid \$100 to me. I have no recollection of the man at all. I went over my books carefully and the statement I have is taken from the books, and his name does not appear on the books at all.

Q. Is the name “W. J. Wilton” the name of the senior member of the firm which you have mentioned?—A. Mr. Wilton came into my firm—

[Hon. E. J. McMurray.]

Q. Are those his initials?—A. It is "J. W. Wilton." He was not in my firm when I was elected to Parliament, but when I came down here I wanted to strengthen the firm if possible to hold my business and Mr. Wilton came in. What I have given here is what I have taken off my books. I thoroughly investigated my books when I went back and I have no trace of Kolchin in any manner or form there.

Q. Would your investigation of your books include, in the ordinary course of business, and investigation of the sums paid to Mr. Wilton as well?—A. I would naturally expect, if Mr. Wilton were a member of the firm, that any moneys paid him would be on the books of the firm. I have no reason to believe otherwise.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that I be at liberty to show the witness a telegram and if he knows nothing about it, I do not intend to pursue the matter further. If he does know, I may then put it on record. I think that is a fair way. I do not wish a telegram to go on record which has no foundation in fact. If that permission is granted I will show the witness the telegram I have in my hand.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the Committee to follow that course?

Several MEMBERS: Carried.

By Mr. Caham:

Q. (Handing telegram to witness) Mr. McMurray, I show you a telegram received by me, and I ask you to read that telegram and tell me whether or not, so far as you are aware, it has any foundation in fact? Do the statements therein contained have any foundation in fact?—A. I know nothing whatever of the matter referred to in this telegram and the fact that the money is not entered in my books would lead me to believe there is no foundation in fact for it at all.

Mr. CAHAN: I submit I am bound to take the statement of the witness and I will not, under those circumstances, put the telegram in evidence. I understand Mr. McMurray to say that, with regard to the allegations made in this telegram, from his examination of the books and from his personal knowledge from his own interventions and the applications which came under his notice, these allegations have no foundation in fact.

The WITNESS: I think that is absolutely correct, sir.

By Mr. Caham:

Q. After you ceased to be Solicitor General, how many applications, in connection with your own business, were made to your office?—A. Up to the present time there were four.

Q. And you state positively that the only fees received were fees not exceeding \$25 in any case?—A. Each fee was \$25 in the cases which I handled, and none of them were handled with the Department here at all; they were handled through the Commissioner at Winnipeg, Mr. Gellay.

Q. But they would come to the Department in due course?—A. I would presume so.

Q. Now, you have given us, as I understand, a full and frank statement of your personal connection with the granting of applications for admission to foreign immigrants?—A. I have, to the best of my ability.

By Hon. Mr. Edwards (Frontenac):

Q. Mr. McMurray, I understood you to say that you dealt with certain applications made to you by parties in Winnipeg who wanted their relatives and others to come out?—A. Yes.

Q. I drew from what you said that these applications became so numerous that you cut them off entirely?—A. Yes.

[Hon. E. J. McMurray.]

Q. Is that a fact?—A. Yes.

Q. Could you give any idea of just about how numerous they became? Were they coming every day?—A. Yes, there was quite a number of them coming in.

Q. Ten or fifteen a day?—A. Oh, I would not say that. Possibly two or three a day, or one a day. It varied.

Q. But they became so numerous— —A. I felt two things in connection with it. First, I felt that as the member for the constituency I ought not to handle them and charge a fee, and secondly, I thought it would react against me if I handled them in a legal way and charged this fee; that is, they would not vote for me afterwards, and that is always a consideration with a member of parliament.

By Mr. McGibbon:

Q. Mr. McMurray, have you any idea, or can you suggest how your name became mixed up in this alleged or supposed conversation between Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Forke?—A. I am absolutely at sea to account for it. Mr. Coldwell I do not know at all; I did not think Mr. Coldwell knew me. There is a horse which they call a "cribber" which sucks wind and it must be on that basis I was gathered in. Otherwise I do not see how it was done.

Q. I must say, Mr. McMurray, that I do not think that remark is in very good order. Mr. Coldwell claimed to be only retailing a conversation, and it seems to me that either his or the Minister's veracity is at stake.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: A conversation that is private—

Mr. MCGIBBON: That is quite true—

The WITNESS: I am on record, sir, when it first came to my attention, that I did not believe the Minister ever made the statement at all, and that is my opinion now.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

By Mr. Coote:

Q. I think you mentioned that the name "Kolchin", if I have the name right, did not appear on your books?—A. No.

Q. Did the name appear on the company's books?—A. No.

Q. Did you search your records?—A. I searched everything.

The CHAIRMAN: That is all, Mr. McMurray. You are excused.

Hon. Mr. McMURRAY: With a clean bill of health, I hope.

Witness retired.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have been endeavouring for a day or two to take up a few moments of your time, and perhaps now I may be allowed to make a statement. It is in connection with an alleged statement made before the Committee on Tuesday last. It will take only a few moments' time.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to hear Mr. Campbell?

Several MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. CAMPBELL: On Tuesday last a newspaper article from the Regina Leader was read here, which gave certain alleged statements of mine in this meeting at Regina on November 23, 1927. I will read to you the only newspaper article I had previously seen in regard to this particular meeting. It appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press of November 25. I may say that in the particular district in which I live the Regina Leader does not circulate; it is usually the Winnipeg papers which circulate there. I will not read the entire article from the Winnipeg Free Press, but the part of it which refers to my remarks at the meeting.

Discussion followed.

[Mr. Campbell, M.P.]

Mr. CAMPBELL: This article says:

Regina, Sask., Nov. 24.—The allegation was made by Alderman M. J. Coldwell at a meeting last night under the auspices of the Sons of England, to discuss immigration, that at a time when the officials had put up the bars on immigration prior to the agreement with the railways of March 16, 1927, "a regular traffic was carried on at Ottawa of the sale of permits to admit men who were not ordinarily eligible for entry into Canada". These permits, he declared, were sold by members of parliament in Canada for the sum of \$100 each. That went on for several years. I am not stating what I do not know to be an absolute fact. It is not hearsay, it is not guesswork. I got that possibly from the highest source in Canada on immigration affairs. These permits were sold and the bars were let down and people were allowed to flow in who were not ordinarily eligible for our immigration."

Milton Campbell, M.P. for Mackenzie, who was present at the meeting and was called upon to speak, humorously remarked he began to tremble when the speaker who had preceded him started to talk about members and the \$100 and wondered how much he had missed, for he had assisted in bringing a good many people to Canada. "We heard these rumours at Ottawa but as close as I was to Ottawa I was not able to get any definite proof," he said.

I may say that my reason for reading that is that I want to make clear to the Committee that in this newspaper report which I saw there was nothing to object to.

Hon. Mr. RALSTON: That is word for word from the Regina Leader.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes, but there was more in the Regina Leader than there is in this—remarks attributed to me which I want to correct.

In the Regina Leader—this appears at page 584 of the proceedings of the Committee, it refers to my statement regarding these rumours, in which I refer to an official who was moved from one branch to another, and the statement attributed to me is this:—

There is no doubt he was making money through bringing in people of a certain race.

I may say, Mr. Chairman and gentleman, that I was referring to rumours which were current around this House some four or five years ago, and I mentioned the rumour that the Minister had unearthed some kind of conspiracy through which this sort of thing was carried on, and I gave some details of the rumours I had heard and then I went on to say that there was somebody making money out of this system, or out of this policy, particularly in connection with the immigration of people of certain races. I was referring, of course, to the non-preferred races who had special difficulty in getting into Canada, and I dealt at considerable length with a criticism of the immigration policy. I objected, first of all, to the spending of a large amount of money in propaganda to induce people to come here. I think I put it this way, or something like this, that spending a large amount of money to induce people to come here and then have it appear when they want to come that we make it as difficult as we possibly can for them to get in, was objectionable. I referred to the amount of correspondence and red tape and formality, documents to be filled out, bonds to be executed, and so on, which made it very difficult for the average settler in this country to endeavour to bring in a friend, and to do so he had to employ a lawyer, and we all know that lawyers do not work for nothing and my objection was that there was a great deal of money being made out of this system in that way. That is what I objected to.

[Mr. Campbell, M.P.]

I may say that the meeting was not reported verbatim. The newspaper reporter who was at the meeting, and upon whom I kept my eyes—because I generally do watch the newspaper reporters in any meeting I am addressing—took only an occasional note, and I presume he summarized the report of the meeting at the close. I may say if any Member of the Committee reads the remarks attributed to me they will find they appear upon their face to be illogical and very unreasonable. First, I am credited with calling Mr. Coldwell's assertion into question, and almost immediately afterwards I am supposed to be giving additional evidence bolstering up his statements, and making them stronger. I think the thing is unreasonable on its face, and the statement in the Regina Leader quoted as a verbatim statement, should be three or four times as extensive as it was, because I dealt in detail with these particular rumours, while the report is boiled down and abbreviated.

Mr. CAHAN: I ask that Mr. Campbell be sworn as I wish to ask him a few questions with regard to that meeting.

Discussion followed.

MILTON J. CAMPBELL, M.P., called and sworn.

By Mr. Cahan:

Q. Mr. Campbell, I understand you were present on November 23rd, 1927, at a meeting held in Regina, a report of which was published in the Regina Leader?—A. Yes.

Q. That was the meeting at which Mr. Coldwell, who has given evidence before this Committee—Alderman M. J. Coldwell—was present and spoke?—A. Yes sir.

Q. Did you understand Mr. Coldwell to say at that meeting, "Definitely I know the names of some Members who sold permits"?—A. Yes, Mr. Coldwell made that remark or a remark very much like that at the close of my remarks. He did not make it at the beginning of the meeting. I addressed a question to him after I was through, and that was his answer.

Q. Previous to Mr. Coldwell making that statement he had referred at some length to the sale of permits. I quote to you a report on Mr. Coldwell's address:—

These permits were sold by Members of Parliament in Canada for the sum of \$100 each.

Did you hear him make a statement to that effect?—A. He did not mention "\$100 each" at the beginning of the meeting. I think that is another proof that the report of the meeting was summarized at the end and not taken down verbatim. He referred to the traffic in permits and at the close of the meeting I turned to him and addressed a direct question to him as to whether he had proof of his allegation and then in his reply he mentioned the sale at \$100 each.

Q. During this meeting, when you intervened, you are reported in the Regina Leader as saying:

I know one man, not a Member of Parliament, but an official who was suddenly transferred to some other part of the world. There was no dismissal, although there was no doubt he was making money through bringing in people of a certain race.

A. That is a statement which I did not make. I referred to the rumours about this conspiracy in 1923 or 1924, which the Minister, according to rumour, had unearthed, and with which, according to the same rumour, there was an official connected.

[Mr. Campbell, M.P.]

Q. Then on this point I wish you to give me your attention for a moment. This report says:

I know one man, not a Member of Parliament, but an official who was suddenly transferred to some other part of the world. There was no dismissal although there was no doubt he was making money through bringing in people of a certain race,

and I ask you to answer "Yes" or "No" whether you made that statement.—A. I did not make that statement.

Q. You did not?—A. No.

Q. But did you refer to any official who had been transferred to some other part of the world?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you make any suggestion as to why he had been so transferred?—

A. I was simply recounting the rumours and giving a basis, as I thought, for the rumours. The rumour was that this man had been transferred, and naturally the assumption was that he was connected with this conspiracy.

Q. Will you please confine your attention to what you said, and not to the inferences which might have been made by the audience? Did you say that there were rumours to the effect that he was making money through bringing in people of a certain race?—A. No. My remarks were prefaced by the rumours, but I simply itemized this or mentioned this man as one of others, according to rumour.

Q. Would you, as nearly as you can recollect your own statement, repeat what you said in connection with this official and his removal, his not being dismissed, and his making money?—A. Well, it would be rather a difficult thing to give that verbatim, because at that particular time I was doing a certain amount of joking about my own position and I felt in rather an embarrassing position, and there was a lot of irrelevant matter introduced. I must have spent fifteen or twenty minutes—probably more than that—dealing with it. I told them that some years ago there were rumours around the House of Commons at Ottawa that a number of men—I think the rumour was there was at least one Member of Parliament, a number of lawyers, and an official—mixed up in some kind of a conspiracy for the sale of permits, or for the illegal immigration of certain people.

Q. Now, Mr. Campbell, can you, of your own personal knowledge, indicate to the Committee who this official was?—A. No, I never heard the name of any of these men.

Q. You have no personal knowledge of the alleged facts upon which these rumours were alleged to have been made?—A. No. I stated before the meeting that I was not able to get any facts.

Q. It was not what you stated there. I want to know now whether you do know, from personal knowledge, directly or indirectly, who this official was and why his removal took place?—A. I do not; I know nothing about it.

Q. You cannot assist the Committee in any respect with regard to that?—A. No.

Q. Were you basing the statement on rumour alone when you said, or are alleged to have said, "I think the man is still in the employment of the Department or some other Department, but he is away in some other part of the earth"? Did you make that statement?—A. I made a statement very much like that; I would not say it was that statement.

Q. And that statement was based entirely upon rumours which had reached your ears, and not based upon any personal knowledge whatsoever?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you at the close of the meeting have any personal conversation with Mr. Coldwell as to the basis of the remark which he had made in your presence from the platform to the audience?—A. No. I have never spoken to Mr. Coldwell since I met him in Regina until I met him here.

[Mr. Campbell, M.P.]

PRODUCTIONS

Filed by witness W. J. Egan, deputy minister of Immigration and Colonization.

MEMORANDUM

The Agreement made on the 1st September, 1925 between the Minister of Immigration and the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, was extended by letter of the 9th September, 1927 as amended by a letter of the 31st October, 1927, addressed by the Minister of Immigration to the President of the Canadian National Railways and the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as follows:—

“Referring to the suspension of certain provisions of the Railways’ Agreement and to recent conference in connection therewith, I have decided to renew the Agreement for a period of three years from the 1st October, 1927, subject to the following changes:—

1. That the Minister of Immigration reserves absolute right to suspend the Agreement either for a stated or indefinite period upon evidence being submitted to him that the parties of the second part have failed to implement the provisions of the said Agreement or that the labour conditions demand such action.

Before suspending the Agreement the parties of the second part will be consulted.

2. That cash nominated and prepaid applications for the admission of single men and men not accompanied by their families, shall be restricted to nominations and applications by persons actually engaged in farming in Canada who desire to bring relatives or others to join them and be employed on the land. As a further safeguard to the transaction of this business it will be necessary to use the nomination and affidavit forms annexed hereto.
3. That the parties of the second part furnish the following information regarding officials who are to issue occupational certificates,—
 - (a) Name and address.
 - (b) A full record of their experience in Canada.
 - (c) Dates of all previous appointments in the service of the Company and in what capacity.
4. That the parties of the second part shall restrict the issue of occupational certificates so as to prevent the arrival in Canada of agricultural families and farm workers at seasons when their placement upon the land cannot be successfully accomplished.
5. Immigration officers shall visé passports in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration Act.
6. That Section 4 of the Agreement dated the 1st day of September, 1925, be struck out and the following substituted therefor,—

“The party of the first part agrees to admit to Canada all immigrants of the aforementioned classes not prohibited by law and to whom occupational certificates shall have been issued and to assist the parties of the second part in receiving the said immigrants by granting the use of the Immigration Halls and the services of the officials of the Department of Immigration and Colonization in connection therewith.”

7. It is mutually agreed that the Agreement shall be subject to cancellation at any time on one year's notice being given by either of the parties to the Agreement, the reasons for such cancellation to be outlined at the time such notice is given and that none of the countries covered by the Agreement shall be withdrawn from the provisions of this Agreement without previous notice and consultation with the parties hereto, the Minister, however, reserving the right to the withdrawal of Russia without such consultation should conditions require such action.

"As requested by one of the parties of the second part, I have consented to these changes or amendments to the original Agreement being signed separately by the representatives of each of the parties of the second part, holding each one separately responsible for implementing the provisions of the Agreement as amended."

AGREEMENT made this first day of September, 1925,

BETWEEN

HIS MAJESTY THE KING in the right of Canada represented herein
by the Honourable Minister of Immigration and Colonization,

Of the First Part,

and

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY and
CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY,

Of the Second Part.

Whereas it is the policy of the Government of Canada to promote the immigration into Canada of persons who, being eligible for admission as immigrants under the Statutes and Orders-in-Council regulating immigration, are of such nationalities, races and modes of life as to be assimilable into the population and citizenship of Canada:

And whereas in pursuance of the said policy the Government desires to procure the immigration of agriculturists, agricultural workers and domestic servants from countries provided for by existing laws and regulations:

And whereas the Parties of the Second Part by reason of their special interest in the early settlement of available unoccupied lands and their transportation facilities by land and sea are specially qualified to procure, select and settle immigrants of the classes mentioned, and have the necessary organizations for that purpose:

And whereas in order to facilitate the movement of immigrants of the aforementioned classes and to avoid duplication of effort, it is expedient that the measure hereinafter set forth should be adopted.

NOW THIS INDENTURE WITNESSES:

1. That the Party of the First Part hereby authorizes the Parties of the Second Part for the period of two years next ensuing to invite persons who are citizens or residents of the countries referred to to emigrate to Canada and to settle them in Canada as agriculturists, agricultural workers and domestic servants.

2. That the Parties to this Agreement recognize and affirm the importance of bringing to Canada only those immigrants mentally, morally, physically and industrially fit and of a type suitable for permanent settlement in the Dominion,

and further that this Agreement is not made with the object of superceding in any way the Immigration regulations that are now or may hereafter be in effect, but rather of joining the forces of the Parties of the Second Part with the Party of the First Part in a Partnership for the improvement of the work in which all are now engaged.

3. That the Parties of the Second Part agree each for itself to use their best efforts in the countries above-mentioned to procure immigrants of the above occupations and to settle them in Canada, and agree that they will in no case bring to Canada any immigrant who shall not be eligible under the immigration laws for admission to Canada, and agree further to transport to the countries whence they emigrated all immigrants brought by them to Canada under the agreement, who, refusing to engage in agriculture, agricultural labour or domestic service in Canada shall become public charges, within the period of one year from the date of their admission to Canada.

4. That the Party of the First Part agrees to admit to Canada all immigrants of the aforementioned classes not prohibited by law who shall be brought to Canada by either of the Parties of the Second Part, and to assist the Parties of the Second Part in receiving and settling the said immigrants by use of immigration halls and the services of the officials of the Land Settlement Branch as well as the officials of the Department of Immigration and Colonization, and the Parties further agree that distribution, placement and such supervision as the new settlers may require after their arrival in Canada, shall be undertaken by the Parties to this Agreement on the basis of joint responsibility.

5. That for the purpose of facilitating such admission the Party of the First Part agrees to provide for the visaing of passports of all immigrants of whom passports are by law required in accordance with instructions of regulations made by the Minister of Immigration and Colonization.

In witness whereof the Parties hereto have executed these presents.

JAMES A. ROBB,

Minister of Immigration and Colonization.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY

H. W. THORNTON, *President.*

R. P. QUINSBY, *Secretary.*

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY

E. W. BEATTY, *President.*

H. C. OSWALD, *Asst. Secretary.*

NOMINATION

(To be completed in triplicate)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY

DEPARTMENT OF COLONIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT, MONTREAL

No.....

For use of General Agents only.

..... 192....

To the Dept. of Colonization and Development of the (Office)

Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I, of (Nominator)

..... nominate for admission to Canada:— (Add. in full)

- (a) The following person who is able to pay his own transportation, or
- (b) For whom I have purchased Canadian Pacific Railway Company Pre-paid Ticket No..... covering Steamship and Rail Transportation from to (In case of Prepaid give name, P.O. address and occupation of Purchaser)

Name Address Occupation

Name of immigrant	Age	Post office address
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

My relationship to the above named immigrant is (If no relationship fill in the words "not related")

I have resided in Canada for years.

I am the owner (or renter) of the following land Area of Farm Area under cultivation Amount of Stock

I declare the above named immigrant is coming to farm employment with me, and that I guarantee employment for him for a period of not less than one year.

Please instruct your nearest officer to interview the proposed immigrant and, provided he is satisfactory, issue occupation certificate in accordance with the terms of the Agreement with the Minister of Immigration and Colonization.

Signer..... (Nominator)

Witness Address

(For use of General Agents Only)

To Department of Colonization and Development,
Montreal,

I have examined this nomination and affidavit,
found them and the Prepaid Ticket accompanying,
if any, in order, and recommend acceptance.

.....
(General Agent)

NOTE.—The affidavit on the reverse side must be completed.

Affidavit

(To be completed in triplicate)

I,
(Nominator's name in full) (Married, Widower or Single)

Residing at
(Occupation)

being first duly sworn do depose and say:—

1. That I have nominated for admission to Canada

2. That the Nominee was born in
(Country of birth)

3. That the Nominee is related to me as follows
(If not related fill in the words "not related")

4. That I (am) or (am not) personally acquainted with the Nominee and desire
to facilitate his admission to Canada and employ him at the following wages
for a period of one year

(State fully reasons you desire the particular person nominated to come to
Canada and enter your employ)

5. That the object of the Nominee in desiring to come to Canada is to come to
me and take employment on my farm.

6. That I am farming acres, the legal description of which is
.....

7. That I have acres under cultivation and the following stock
.....

8. That I have provided the following housing accomodation for the immigrant

Signature.....
(Nominator)

Subscribed and Sworn to before me, a Notary
Public in and for the said Province, and
personally known to the deponent of the fore-
going instrument, this
day of A.D. 192....

(Notary Public)

To whom it may concern;

This is to certify that living at the above
address is personally known to me and that he is farming the land above des-
cribed, is honest and trustworthy and of good character, and would be a proper
employer for farm help.

(Manager)

(Name of Bank)

at
or

(Justice of the Peace)

(Address)

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES IN THE UNITED STATES AND
TERRITORY ASSIGNED TO EACH

<i>Agency</i>	<i>Territory</i>
Boston, Mass., M. A. Bowley, Agent, 73 Tremont St.	Massachusetts (all English business), Connecticut (all English business), (see Woonsocket territory).
Chicago, Ill., C. J. Broughton, Agent, 112 W. Adams St.	Illinois.
Columbus, Ohio, W. S. Nethery, Agent, Room S, Commercial National Bldg., 9 E. Long St.	Wisconsin—Counties of Iron, Vilas, Price, Oneida, Forest, Florence, Marinette, Lincoln, Taylor, Langlade, Oconto, Marathon, Shawano, Portage, Waupaca, Outagamie, Brown, Kewaunee, Door, Adams, Waushara, Winnebago, Calumet, Manitowoc, Marquette, Green Lake, Fond du Lac, Sheboygan, Columbia, Dodge, Washington, Ozaukee, Grant, Iowa, Dane, Jefferson, Waukesha, Milwaukee, Lafayette, Green, Rock, Walworth, Racine and Kenosha.
Detroit, Mich., F. W. Kerr, Agent, 10 Jefferson Ave., E.	Ohio, West Virginia, Georgia, Florida.
Fargo, N.D., W. E. Black, Agent, 117 Robert St.	Michigan.
Great Falls, Mont., Geo. A. Cook, Agent, 10 Central Ave.	North Dakota, South Dakota.
Harrisburg, Pa., F. A. Harrison, Agent, 303 North 2nd St.	Minnesota—Counties of Kittson, Marshall, Polk, Norman and Clay.
Indianapolis, Ind., R. A. Garrett, Agent, 130 Monument Circle.	Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado.
Kansas City, Mo., M. J. Johnstone, Agent, 2025 Main St.	Idaho—South of the Snake River from the Eastern boundary of Owyhee County.
Manchester, N.H., J. B. Riordon, Agent, 43 Manchester St.	Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.
Omaha, Nebr., A. E. Pilkie, Agent, 1313 Farnam St.	Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi.
St. Paul, Minn., K. Haddeland, Agent, 329 Jackson St.	Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona.
San Francisco, Calif., G. Roche, Agent, 687 Market St.	Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont.
Spokane, Wash., D. N. McDonell, Act. Agent, cor. 1st and Post Sts.	Nebraska, Iowa.
Syracuse, N.Y., C. E. S. Smith, Agent, 301 E. Genesee St.	Minnesota—Except Counties of Kittson, Marshall, Polk, Norman and Clay (see Fargo territory).
Woonsocket, R.I., L. A. Delorme, Agent, Room 205, The Call Bldg.	Wisconsin—Including Counties of Douglas, Bayfield, Ashland, Burnett, Washburn, Sawyer, Polk, Barron, Rusk, St. Croix, Dunn, Chippewa, Pierce, Pepin, Eau Claire, Clark, Buffalo, Templeau, Jackson, Wood, La Crosse, Monroe, Juneau, Vernon, Crawford, Richland, Sauk.
	California, Nevada.
	Washington, Oregon.
	Idaho—Remainder of State (see Great Falls Territory).
	New York.
	Rhode Island.
	Inquiries originating in the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts which require to be dealt with in French are referred to Agent at Woonsocket.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT AGENTS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

- J. Bruce Walker, Director of European Emigration, Canadian Building, Trafalgar Square, London, S.W. 1, England.
- F. W. Campbell, Exchange Bldgs., Stephenson Place, Birmingham, England.
- John Cardale, 52 Baldwin St., Bristol, England.
- Wm. Griffith, 310 High St., Bangor, Wales.
- C. A. Allen, 102 New India Bldg., Water St., Liverpool, England.
- J. H. Lough, 17-19 Victoria St., Belfast, Ireland.
- J. L. Malcolm, 107 Hope St., Glasgow, Scotland.
- Wm. Story (Acting Agent), 44 Dawson St., Dublin, Ireland.
- F. B. Cotsworth, Clifford St., York, England.
- Miss A. MacDonald, 33 Academy St., Inverness, Scotland.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT IMMIGRATION OFFICERS STATIONED ON THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE

- Antwerp*—J. A. Mitchell, Canadian Govt. Emigration Officer, 9 Quai Van Dyck, Antwerp, Belgium.
- Danzig*—O. Cormier, Canadian Govt. Emigration Officer, 9 Elisabethwall, Danzig.
- Hamburg*—J. A. Chapdelaine, Canadian Govt. Emigration Officer, Mundsburgerdamm 11, Hamburg, Germany.
- Paris*—E. Belanger, Canadian Govt. Emigration Officer, 52 Blvd. Hausseman, Paris, France.
- Riga*—A. O. Petersen, Canadian Govt. Emigration Officer, Maza Pelduiela No. 4, Riga, Latvia.
- Rotterdam*—G. A. B. Buchanan, Canadian Govt. Emigration Officer, 55 Stationsweg, Rotterdam, Holland.

9. A medical certificate from a Doctor on the Continent does not guarantee that the emigrant is in good health and that he is free from any infectious disease. Therefore state exact condition of mental and physical health of yourself and individual members of family.

10. Have you or has any member of your family suffered at any time from family epilepsy or tuberculosis in any form, or any infectious disease?

11. If you or any member of your family has any physical defect, give particulars.

12. Have you or has any member of your family ever been treated in an institution or Home? If so, give particulars.

13. State intended occupation in Canada.

14. Where?

15. Is such occupation assured? If so, by whom?

16. Have you lived in Canada or elsewhere Overseas?

(a) Where

(b) Between what dates?

17. Can you pay your own fare to final destination in Canada?

(a) What money will you possess in addition, at time of landing in Canada?

FARM WORKER FORM

This form is the general form of application signed by single or married British farm workers seeking passage assistance to come to Canada.

Department of Immigration and Colonization,
Government of Canada.

File No.....

INFORMATION FORM

Date.....192...

- 1. Name in full.....Age.....
(Print your surname in Block Letters)
- 2. Address
- 3. Place of birth..... 3a. Present Nationality.....
- 4. Religion
- 5. Married or Single or Widower..... 5a Age of Wife if living.....
- 6. No. of Children.....
(State age and sex of each)
- 7. Will your Wife and Children accompany you?.....
- 8. If not, what provision are you making for them in this country?.....
- 9. A medical certificate from a Doctor on the Official Roster may be required; therefore state exact condition of mental and physical health of yourself and individual members of family:
.....
- 10. Have you or has any member of your family suffered at any time from insanity, epilepsy or tuberculosis in any form, or any infectious disease?....
- 11. If you or any member of your family has any physical defect, give particulars.....
- 12. Have you or has any member of your family ever been treated in an Institution or Home?.....If so, give particulars.....
- 13. State intended occupation in Canada.....
- 14. Where?.....
- 15. Is such occupation assured?..... 15a. By whom?.....
- 16. Have you lived in Canada or elsewhere Overseas?.....
(a) Where
- (b) Between what dates?.....
- 17. Can you pay your own fare to final destination in Canada?.....
(a) What money will you possess in addition, at time of landing in Canada?.....

18. If relatives or friends are providing a home, give name, address and relationship, and state how long they have been in Canada.....

19. How many years have you farmed?..... What kind of farming?..... Can you milk?..... Can you plough?..... How many horses can you handle?..... What experience with other l. stock.....

20. Are you working on a farm?..... If not, state last occupation.....

21. Give names and addresses of TWO FARMERS for whom you have worked and HOW LONG WITH EACH. If you have not been employed on a farm state so, and give names and addresses of your last employers. Name..... Address..... Name..... Address.....

22. Give name and address in British Isles of parents or nearest living relative (state relationship).....

23. When do you wish to leave for Canada? (If possible give name of steamer, date of sailing and class by which you intend to travel, and rail destination in Canada).....

24. If you are in communication with a Shipping or Booking Agent, give his name and address..... Signature.....

(to be filled in by Can. Govt. Agent.)

25. Origin of business.....

19a. Are you capable of harnessing, hitching and driving horses?.....

19b. Are you capable of operating the simpler farming implements, such as cultivators, discs, harrows and rollers?.....

Table with 3 columns: From Year, To Year, Employer's Name, Occupation and Address. Includes a section for 'Name of Work Performed'.

BRITISH FAMILY FORM

The attached form is filled in by the British families to be settled on the land. There is a second short form to be signed by the applicant and his wife. These are used for families who are settled on farms and receive the \$1,500 settlement loan provided by the British Government.

L.S.B. Form No. C18

Dominion of Canada

Department of Immigration and Colonization

APPLICATION FORM

(SETTLEMENT OF BRITISH FAMILIES IN CANADA)

(Please complete this Form in your own handwriting and answer all Questions fully in Order to avoid delay)

To the Canadian Emigration Office.

We are interested in the plan for the settlement of British Families on the land in Canada. We desire to have our qualifications investigated in order that we may, if approved, proceed to Canada and secure agricultural employment prior to qualifying for assistance under the above plan. We beg to submit the following:—

Section 1. (Head of Family)

- (a) Name in full.
(Write name clearly in printed letters)
- (b) Present address in full.
(Giving nearest station and county)
- (c) Age.Religion.Present occupation.
- (d) Employer's name and address.
- (e) Nationality.Birthplace.
(English, Scotch, Irish or Welsh)
- (f) Married or Widower.Years married.
- (g) Did you serve in military or naval forces during the Great War; if so, where and unit?
- (h) Have you any physical disability?
(State nature and extent)
- (i) Are you in receipt of pension?Amount per annum £.
(State whether service of disability)
- (j) Have you ever resided in Canada, if so between what dates?

Section 2. (Experience)

- (a) Were you born or brought up on a farm?
(Give details)
- (b) Give full details of your employment since leaving school.

From Year	To Year	Employer's Name, Occupation and Address	Nature of Work You Performed
.....
.....
.....

- (c) If you have had any agricultural experience in Britain or elsewhere, which is not detailed above, please give full details, showing the nature of work you performed.
- (d) Can you groom, harness and drive horses?
- (e) Plough? Milk? Do rough carpentry?
- (f) Do you understand the handling and care of dairy cattle?
- (g) Sheep? Swine? Poultry?
- (h) A farm garden? Small fruits? Orchards?

Section 3. (References)

- (a) Give the names, addresses and occupations of three responsible parties (not relatives) to whom we can refer for recommendations as to character, ability, industry and thrift (Employers preferred).

Name	Address	Occupation
.....
.....
.....

Section 4. (Assets)

- (a) How much actual Cash have you now? £.
- (b) How much money will you have before you sail, after disposing of all your effects and paying all your debts?
- (c) Do you propose to take with you sufficient bedding and blankets, linen, crockery, cutlery, and small cooking utensils to suffice for your early needs?

Section 5. This Section to be completed by wife

- (a) Wife's name (in full) Age
- (b) Nationality Birthplace
- (c) Children Boys aged and Girls aged
- (d) Have you or they any physical disability?
(State nature and extent)
- (e) Do they all intend to sail under this plan and remain with parents or in vicinity?
- (f) Have you any other dependents, related or otherwise?
(If so, give particulars and state if they will accompany you)
- (g) Do you desire any female relative or friend not already mentioned to accompany your family? If so, give name, age and address.
- (h) Can you milk? Care of poultry? Tend farm garden?
- (i) Were you born or brought up on a farm, or have you had any training which would specially fit you for farm work?

Section 6

(a) Is it your desire to settle in any particular district or province? (Where)

(b) State date on which you will be ready to sail.
(It is preferable that sailings should take place between February 15 and April 1 if proceeding to British Columbia and between March 15 and April 15 to other provinces).

I declare that the answers given to the above questions are, to the best of my knowledge, true and correct.

.....
(Signature of Applicant)

I believe that my husband is sincere in his intentions to make farming his life work. I am aware of the individual responsibility resting on those who would engage successfully in farming. I am in favour of his engaging in farming and am willing to live on a farm, co-operate and assist him in his undertaking in every possible way.

.....
(Signature of Wife)

Place
Date

BRITISH FAMILY SCHEME

STATEMENT BY APPLICANT AND WIFE

- (a) Have you and your wife carefully read the booklet describing the scheme, headed "Assisted Settlement of Approved British Families on Canadian Government Farms"?
- (b) Do you understand that on arrival in Canada your wife and family will be accommodated in a house on a Canadian Government Farm, and that you must have sufficient funds on arrival at your destination to enable you to furnish this house and to provide subsistence for your wife and children until such time as you are in receipt of wages?.....
- (c) Do you understand that for the first season at least, you will be required to accept agricultural employment, with a view to gaining experience, and that your final acceptance for settlement is contingent on the showing that you make whilst so employed?.....
- (d) Do you appreciate that there is practically no demand in Canada for workers other than agricultural workers, and that you must therefore be prepared to carry out the present understanding, namely, that you will accept agricultural employment with a view to engaging in farming?
- (e) Do you understand that to succeed, both you and your family will have to learn each to do his or her share of the farm work necessary for the care of the garden, poultry, dairy cows, hogs, etc., and must be prepared to work out with neighbours, etc., in order to supplement your resources during the early years of your establishment?.....

.....
Signature of Applicant.....

.....
Signature of Wife.....

HOUSEWORKERS FORM

Form E is the form used in connection with assisted passages under the Empire Settlement Scheme. It is the only form filled up by the houseworker unless the houseworker secures a loan, in which case she signs her name to an Agreement to refund the amount of the loan. The houseworker fills in the answers to Nos. 1 to 16 and the two questions in the box at the bottom of the form. The result of the medical examination is on the reverse side of this form. The girl has nothing to do with filling that in.

FORM E.

I. & C. No.
O.S.O. No.

CANADA

Department of Immigration and Colonization

1. Name in full. Age.
(Print surname in block letters)
2. Present address.
3. Permanent address.
4. Place of birth. Nationality.
5. Single, married, widowed or divorced. Religion.
6. Name, relationship and address of nearest relative in the British Isles.
7. Present occupation. Intended occupation.
8. To whom destined overseas.
(Give full name and address, and state if friend, relative or employer)
9. Name of Steamer by which you are sailing.
10. Date of sailing. Name of Booking Agent.
(Address)
11. Class of ocean travel (Cabin or Third)
12. Have you ever resided in Canada? If so, for how long?
13. When did you last leave Canada and for what purpose?
14. Have you any friends or relatives in The United States of America? If so, where?
15. If accompanied by children give the following particulars:—

Name	Age	Sex	Name	Age	Sex
.....
.....

I declare the above statements are correct.

16. Applicant's own Signature. Date.

17. I hereby certify that the applicant is personally known to me and.

(Indicate what you know of the applicant's character, industry and honesty and whether you believe the above questions have been correctly answered)

18. Signature. Address

19. Calling. Date.

(To be signed by one of the following, to whom the applicant is personally

known: A member or official of any Banking firm established in the United Kingdom, any Mayor, Minister of religion, registered Medical Practitioner, Barrister-at-law, Solicitor, Notary Public, Magistrate or Justice of the Peace.)

Additional questions to be filled in by house-workers who are unable to pay their own passage:—
1. What amount can you pay towards the cost of transportation to destination in Canada?
.....
2. Have you applied for passage assistance from any other source?.....If so, from what source?

Interviewed at
Date
by
Canadian Emigration Officer.

Medical Examination

Instructions to Medical Examiner

In cases where the Medical Examiner is unable to describe the applicant as being in good health, he should state under "REMARKS" the exact nature of the defect which he finds and whether it is of a temporary or permanent nature. Any disablement received on Active Service or otherwise should also be noted and commented on.

To avoid needless hardship the Medical Examiner is particularly requested to satisfy himself that the applicant is in every way a fit subject to pass a thorough medical examination, as applicants are liable to rejection both at the ports of embarkation and at the port of arrival. The presence of Pediculi or Nits should be noted hereon. In the case of married women, if pregnant, please note the fact in "Remarks" column, and state number of months.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that I have this day examined.....
..... (Full Name)
of..... (Named on this form) and
report as follows:—

- 1. Heart.....
- 2. Lungs (particularly Tuberculosis).....
- 3. Has she ever been in a Sanatorium or other institution or attended thereat for the treatment of Tuberculosis?.....
- 4. Any sign of disease of the Genito-Urinary Organs.....
- 5. Nervous System and Mental Condition.....
State whether she has ever suffered from Mental Disease or Epilepsy or been treated in any institution of any kind for these diseases.....
- 6. Sight..... 7. Hearing.....
- 8. Physique..... 9. Skin..... 10. Vaccinated.....
- 11. Digestive Organs and Teeth.....
- 12. If receiving a Pension: How much weekly?.....

REMARKS.....
.....
.....
Age..... Height..... Weight.....

Having read and made myself conversant with the instructions contained in Form KA, supplied me, I certify that I have this day examined the above-named and am, therefore, of the opinion that she is in.....health

and of constitution. She is not suffering from any mental or bodily defect which in my opinion would unfit her for earning her own living as a in Canada.

Date

Signature
Qualifications
Address

I hereby certify that the information supplied by me to the Medical Examiner is correct in every particular:—

Signature of applicant which must be made in }
the presence of the Medical Examiner. }

Instructions to Persons being Examined

1. For children a separate statement or medical schedule is required.
2. Under no circumstances will any Medical Certificate be accepted unless duly certified by a Medical Referee who is on the Official Roster and whose name is given to you with this form.
3. It must be fully understood that the fees for Medical Examination must be paid by yourself. The Maximum Scale of Fees is as follows: 10/6 for each adult of 16 years or over; 2/6 for each child under 16 years of age accompanied by parents or guardians with a limit of £1 6s. 0d. for the examination of any one family, not more than two children to be charged for under the age of 16 years. Children unaccompanied 10/6 each irrespective of age.
4. This Medical Certificate is for your assistance and guidance but does not in any way guarantee your admission to Canada. The Medical Examination that admits you to Canada takes place at the Canadian port of arrival.
If this Certificate does not show that you and your dependents are in good *mental* and physical health, correspond at once with your nearest Canadian Government Emigration Agent and defer booking your passage until advised whether or not your difficulties can be cleared up.

OFFICIALS WHOM YOU MAY SEE OR WRITE TO

London—Director of European Emigration for Canada, The Canadian Building, Trafalgar Square, S.W.1.

Canadian Government Emigration Agents at:—

- 48, Lord Street, Liverpool.
- 139, Corporation Street, Birmingham.
- 52, Baldwin Street, Bristol.
- Canada Chambers, Museum Street, York..
- 310, High Street, Bangor (Wales).
- 107, Hope Street, Glasgow.
- 33, Academy Street, Inverness.
- 44, Dawson Street, Dublin.
- 17-19, Victoria Street, Belfast.

MEMORANDUM

The Committee on Agriculture and Colonization desire to be supplied with the instructions issued by the Department to Agents in the United States, the British Isles and the Continent of Europe.

Owing to the period of years covered since the establishment of most of these agencies and the fact that instructions have not always been issued in the form of numbered circulars, it is impossible within the time available to give anything like a complete record.

Attached is a sample circular of instructions, known as Circular No. 1-26, issued to Agents in the United States. Further instructions are issued dealing with matters as they arise from time to time. Instructions are also issued by letter to individual agents.

Instructions to Agents in the British Isles and to Immigration Inspectors on the Continent of Europe are issued from the London Office by the Director of European Emigration. For the most part these are based on general letters of direction issued by Head Office at Ottawa, each letter dealing with one subject or one or more phases of a subject. Such circulars and letters cover a considerable period of years. They relate to such matters as field work, office records, reports, Immigration regulations, policy, assisted passages, primary inspection, the operation of the Railways' Agreement, etc.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

OTTAWA, January 14th, 1926.

CIRCULAR No. 1-26

To Canadian Government Agents in the United States

ADVERTISING:

The following changes are begin made in advertisements appearing in United States newspapers or periodicals:—

- (a) The coupon is being discontinued.
- (b) Inquirers are being referred to the various Canadian Information Bureaux instead of to Ottawa.
- (c) Inquirers are being asked not only to write a letter but also to forward the advertisement to each Bureau. In addition, a key number is being inserted in each advertisement. This will enable you to register the origin of the business.
- (d) Some periodicals have a wide circulation in many States. The names of only four or five of our different offices, however, will appear in these advertisements. The names of the offices which will appear in the advertisements will be determined by circulation, by central location to facilitate distribution of replies and with a view to advertising all of our offices in at least some of what are known as "National Papers".

2. REPORTS AND RECORDS.

(1) A "Prospect Memorandum" will be substituted for the book "Reports on Prospects", which does not appear to have ever been used for the purpose for which it was intended.

(2) An "Inquiry and Prospect Book" will be substituted for the present large Inquiry Book, which will be discontinued. The "Monthly Report" will be prepared from the new "Inquiry and Prospect Book". The data in the new "Inquiry and Prospect Book" will be compiled from:

- (a) Replies to Advertisements.
- (b) Replies to Letters.
- (c) Interviews in the office and outside.
- (d) Development of cases.

(3) Thirteen reports are now being received monthly from each Bureau. These reports, with two exceptions, viz., Literature and Attendance, are to be discontinued in their present form. In addition to the Literature and Attendance Reports there will be only one monthly report, which will be headed "Monthly Report of Business", Sheets "A" and "B".

3. PROSPECT MEMORANDUM.

For interviews there is being forwarded a supply of "Prospect Memorandum" which shows the information to be obtained. The form of "Prospect Memorandum" should be used in the case of every good prospect and it should also be used in the case of every probable prospect who is interviewed. This form should not be used, of course, in the case of an ordinary inquirer who is not even considered a probable prospect.

(a) *Use of form.*—The "Prospect Memorandum" is being supplied in padded form for convenience when interviewing. It may be advisable in some cases not to insert the information in front of the inquirer, who may dislike to see a record taken, but in most cases you will be able to insert the information at the time of the interview. In any case the data should be inserted while the interview is fresh in your mind.

(b) As soon as an inquirer becomes a good prospect, an individual file should be made. Previous correspondence and the new "Prospect Memorandum" should form the basis of the individual file. In addition to the information indicated on the "Prospect Memorandum", the agent should obtain whatever additional information he considers should be obtained in connection with any good prospect.

(c) *Origin of business.*—In most cases the origin of business will be the newspaper advertisement, but there will no doubt be many cases where the agent should be given credit for the origin of the business. The interview will disclose this information, which should be inserted in the "Prospect Memorandum".

(d) Particulars on the "Prospect Memorandum" should be entered only in the "Inquiry and Prospect Book". In other words, it will not now be necessary to transfer information from the "Prospect Memorandum" to cards or any other books or documents.

4. INQUIRY AND PROSPECT BOOK.

(a) The "Register of Inquiries", several of which are in use in some of the Bureaux, should be discontinued. These books should be carefully laid past, but must, of course, be used for reference until all the inquirers whose names appear therein have been developed or completed.

- (b) The "Inquiry and Prospect Book" will contain loose leaves. Serial numbers are not being printed and it will therefore be necessary to insert the serial number opposite each name. (See Section 7, Paragraph (k)).
- (c) "*D. No*".—This heading means "District Number". Some of the agents file replies to advertisements under districts and some under a central point, etc. It is advisable to have a uniform system and file replies to advertisements by districts, e.g., you should place in one folder the replies to advertisements from a certain number of counties. The agent will decide what counties should be included in one district. There should be one folder for all replies to advertisements from one district and these replies should be filed alphabetically in the folder. This will obviate the necessity of either a book or card index for inquirers. An inquiry which becomes a good prospect should be removed from these folders, individual files being made in such cases. (See Section 3, Paragraph (b)).
- (d) "*Date written to*".—The three columns headed "Date Written To" mean that you insert in these columns the dates of follow-up letters which it is considered should be written before the demise of an inquiry.
- (e) "*Good Prospects*". If, for instance, a good prospect were established to-day, you should insert in that column the following entry:—
 "14-1-26." (14th Jan., 1926).

This will enable you to determine at the end of the month the number of good prospects that have been established during the month. It would further facilitate the work in this particular column if you ticked in red all the good prospects which had been established and which had been reported to Ottawa. The result would be a quicker compilation of good prospects for next month's report.

- (f) "*File*". This column for the file number has been provided immediately after the column "Good Prospects". The individual file should be opened only after the good prospect has been established. (See Section 3, Paragraph (b)).
- (g) "*C.L.S.A.*". This column will show the C.L.S.A. certificates issued or, in other words, it will indicate the settlers who have been sent to Canada. On the other hand, it may indicate a landseeker. Please insert after the number of the Certificate the letter "S", which would mean that a C.L.S.A. Certificate had been issued to a settler; e.g., "23567 S". This would distinguish between an actual settler and a landseeker.

5. MONTHLY REPORT OF BUSINESS.

- (a) "*C.L.S.A. Certificates Issued*". Under this heading insert the particulars required. If there is not sufficient space, then continue on Page 2. In the Report insert the letter "S" after the number of the C.L.S.A. Certificate in the case of each settler. Where the letter "S" is not inserted, the Department will assume that the Certificate has been issued to a landseeker on an inspection tour, as distinguished from a settler who is going to Canada to reside.
- (b) "*Actual Business Transacted*". You will notice in the space marked "2" on Sheet "B" that there are two columns, namely, "Fiscal Year" and "Month". The first is cumulative and the second shows the total business for the month.

You will notice in the space marked "3", "Good Prospects", there are three columns:

- (1) "*On Hand First of Month*". This column should show all good prospects on hand up to and including the last day of the preceding month, but should not include previous good prospects who have become settlers, nor previous good prospects who have withdrawn or otherwise ceased to be good prospects.
- (2) "*New During the Month*". In this column you should insert all good prospects established during the month, covered by the report. The total of this and the preceding column will show the live prospects existing who have not yet become settlers.
- (3) "*Withdrawn*". You must not include in this column good prospects who have become settlers, but only previous good prospects who have withdrawn or who have ceased to be good prospects for any other cause.

- (c) The first columns in Spaces "4", "5" and "6" are also cumulative and in each case action should be taken as described in Paragraph (b) of this Section for Space "2".

It will be necessary for you to retain on file a duplicate of the "Monthly Report of Business" so that at the end of each month you can add to the cumulative column the number which appears as the business transacted during the month; e.g., if you received 200 inquiries during the month of April—the first month of the fiscal year—this number would appear in both columns numbered "2". If 300 inquiries were received during the month of May, then the figure "500" would appear in the cumulative column "Fiscal Year" and the figure "300" would appear in the column "Month". During the month of June, if 100 inquiries were received, then the number "600" would appear in the column "Fiscal Year" and "100" in the column "Month".

6. FIELD WORK, GENERAL.

- (a) The Department desires that particulars of every good prospect established shall be shown on the "Prospect Memorandum", which must form the basis of the individual file. These files will be inspected periodically.
- (b) *Interviewing*. Arrangements should be made to interview all those who appear to be good prospects. Hitherto you have been interviewing all inquirers. In future you will develop an inquiry by correspondence or otherwise to the point where it appears to be a good prospect before arranging an interview.
- (c) *Routing*. When preparing your route for the purpose of interviewing, you should also advise those along the line of route who have not replied that you will be in the district and will call if desired. If no response is received, you may assume that the inquirer is no longer interested, but in some cases it might be advisable to interview, provided not much expenditure is involved. This is a matter which will be left to the discretion of the agents.
- (d) *Good Prospects*. The entries in the space provided for this purpose should not include simple inquiries or cases out of which immigration business is not likely to arise, but only reasonably good prospects, that is, people who give some indication of their interest in Canada and who are of a suitable type. The term "Good Prospect" would include a farmer who has decided to sell or vacate his farm and who is seeking information regarding settlement in Canada. The estab-

lishment of a prospect, however, must be left in large measure to the agents, whose judgment in that respect will be shown by those who withdraw or who cease to be prospects as shown by the "Monthly Report".

7. OFFICE WORK.

- (a) The Department desires all agents to reply by first mail to every inquirer.
- (b) Special attention should be given to all inquirers who give a rural mail delivery address. There may be exceptions, but as a general rule it should be assumed that these inquirers are farmers or persons genuinely interested in land settlement.
- (c) An individual letter should, if possible, be written in reply to all rural mail delivery inquiries or other cases which might be developed to good prospects. These letters should be signed by the agent or on his behalf. A circular or stereotype form of letter does not create a good impression.
- (d) A new file should be made as soon as an inquirer becomes a good prospect. File backs will be supplied for this purpose.
- (e) An alphabetical card index will be required for the files of good prospects. Alphabetical index cards must not be used as an index for letters on file, because this creates unnecessary work. The alphabetical index card should contain only the number of the file, the name and address of the person concerned and the subject. In some offices these cards contain a synopsis of every letter. Agents will please discontinue this practice.
- (f) The serial number of the inquiry should be inserted in the upper right hand corner of the "Prospect Memorandum". This information is necessary so that whoever may be inspecting the office can at once trace the entry in the "Inquiry and Prospect Book" from the file of a good prospect, which will be examined when the office is inspected.
- (g) Agents should discontinue, as much as possible, using the printed form of letters, which do not create a very good impression. In the absence of an agent some stenographers may be able to answer correspondence by giving the requisite information. It may be necessary, however, to use the printed form of letter in the case of any very large number of follow-up letters, especially in doubtful cases. All letters, however, should be signed either by or on behalf of the agent.
- (h) Annexed to this memorandum is a form of letter which you might give to any settler or landseeker when leaving for Canada. The Commissioner of Immigration is advising all boundary Inspectors to give special attention to those cases and to lift these letters for transmission to the Department. An individual letter should be written in each case. An individual letter will be regarded by the recipient as of more value than a printed form or duplicate.
- (i) The object of Sheet "B" of the "Prospect Report" is to show the value of advertising in each newspaper. You will notice that the ultimate value is not the inquiry nor the good prospect, but the settler, his capital and effects.
- (j) The new "Inquiry and Prospect Book" will be loose leaf. A leaf must not be removed unless it is initialled by an officer of the Department from Ottawa. Loose leaves which, after being initialled, are removed from the "Inquiry and Prospect Book" should not be destroyed but carefully laid past for future reference. You will be advised in due course as to when such records should be destroyed.

(k) Upon receipt of the new "Inquiry and Prospect Book" you should transfer from the present "Register of Inquirers" the names and particulars of all good prospects and also from time to time any inquirers whose names now appear in the "Register of Inquirers" and who later become good prospects. On transfer give these names a new serial number.

8. You will discontinue, as from the 31st January, 1926, the following forms of reports:—

(1) Weekly Diary Report..	4
(2) Monthly Report of Interviews..	1
(3) Monthly Report of Directing Certificates..	1
(4) Monthly Report of Persons going to Canada for the purpose of inspecting land..	1
(5) Monthly Report of C.L.S.A. Certificates..	1
(6) Summary of C.L.S.A. Certificate Report..	1
(7) Arrival Card Form..	1
(8) Report of Returning Canadians..	1
<hr/>	
Total..	11

9. You will send only the following reports:—

- (1) Monthly Report of Business, Sheets "A" and "B".
- (2) Monthly Attendance Report.
- (3) Monthly Literature Report.

10. When transmitting your "Monthly Report of Business," your covering letter should explain why any prospect is eliminated from the report.

11. It was intended to ask agents for suggestions regarding the new "Inquiry and Prospect Book" but this was found impossible in view of the fact that it has been decided to change forthwith the method of advertising in the United States. You are invited, however, to make suggestions on any matter connected with any branch of your work. The value of an agency will be appraised upon results, i.e., number of settlers sent to Canada, having regard to area and rural population.

Agents are also especially requested to write to the Department for any material information which they may not have in their possession and which may be required either in connection with the work generally or as the result of a specific request by any inquirer.

Commissioner of Colonization.

OTTAWA,, January 14, 1926.

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION INSPECTOR-IN-CHARGE..

This letter will be presented to you by..,
 who is proceeding to..
 to take up land (or to inspect land with a view to purchase or settlement).
 Any courtesies which you may extend to Mr.
 will be appreciated.

Canadian Information Bureau Representative.

MEMORANDUM

For Committee on Agriculture and Colonization

Subjects Contracts or arrangements between the Department of Immigration and Colonization and various societies and organizations interested in various phases of immigration and colonization work.

In the last Annual Report of the Department of Immigration and Colonization (copy herewith), there will be found on Page 68 a list of the societies interested in juvenile immigration. There are no formal contracts or agreements between the Immigration Department and any of these organizations. Each organization is recognized by the Department as a society co-operating with the Department in this branch of immigration work. Several of the societies have been engaged in the work for many years and the recognition has continued during all that period.

The recognition of the Department is always dependent upon the society setting up in Canada a proper organization to handle juvenile immigrants and establishing a proper centre for distribution, etc.

All juvenile immigration work under the auspices of the various societies is a co-operative movement. Passage grants covering the fares of children are made by the Department of Immigration and Colonization on behalf of the British Government as well as on behalf of Canada. The grants are shared on a 50/50 basis. Before such grants are made children are inspected. On arrival in Canada the children are placed by the societies, the boys at farm work and the girls at house work. The societies report the placement to the Department immediately it is made and inspectors of the Department visit the children who are also visited by the Inspectors of the Society.

The Department of Immigration and Colonization has also co-operative working arrangements with various other organizations. None of these are set out in a formal contract but generally by a series of letters. The following list is submitted merely as examples:—

1. A co-operative arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian National Railways for the movement of British agricultural families and single men suitable for farm work. These receive passage assistance under the Empire Settlement passage agreement. They are placed in employment by the Colonization Branches of the Railways. The placement is reported to the Department and the Department gives aftercare.
2. A somewhat similar arrangement exists between the Department and the Hudson's Bay Oversea Settlement, Limited, the Social Service Council of the Church of England, the United Church of Canada, the Salvation Army, the British Settlement Society, the Scottish Immigrant Aid Society.

The arrangement with the Scottish Immigrant Aid Society and with the Salvation Army has differed and still differs from the others in two or three important particulars. The Department has given an annual grant of \$5,000 to the Scottish Immigrant Aid Society for a period of five years and has, during a considerable part of that time paid the salary and travelling expenses of the Society's Secretary or Manager, Father Andrew MacDonell. A new arrangement has been entered into under which for next fiscal year a grant of \$3,750 will be made to this Society, but the Department will not continue to pay salary and expenses to Father MacDonell.

FILED BY WITNESS, W. J. EGAN,
Deputy Minister of Immigration.

No. 1 of the "Productions" called for at the last immigration hearing of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization calls for a statement of the date and authority for the Department of Health undertaking immigration medical inspection. The following documents are therefore submitted:—

(1) Copy of P.C. 1627, of the 2nd August, 1919, with copy of schedule attached thereto. This is the Order that transferred certain medical and other officers from the Department of Immigration and Colonization to the Department of Health.

(2) Copy of Section 4 of the Department of Health Act, which is Chapter 90 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927. Clause (c) of Section 4 establishes the connection of the Department of Health with immigration inspection.

(3) A copy of P.C. 16/1232, of the 25th June, 1927. This has to do with the establishment of the Canadian Medical Inspection Service overseas.

P.C. 1627

CERTIFIED copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 2nd August, 1919.

The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, advise that under the provisions of the Department of Health Act, chapter 24 of the Statutes of 1919, the President of the Privy Council be named as the Minister of the Crown to preside over the Department of Health.

The Committee, on the same recommendation further advise that, under the provisions of the said Act, the officers, clerks and employees mentioned in the schedule hereto be transferred to the Department of Health, and that the necessary action be taken forthwith to complete such transfer.

RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable
The Minister of Immigration and Colonization.

LIST OF EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC HEALTH BRANCH

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, AND SALARIES

Name	Rank	Address	Amount of salary
			\$ cts.
Dr. F. Montizambert....	Dir. Gen. Public Health..	Ottawa.....	\$5,000 00
Miss A. L. Brown.....	Clerk.....	".....	1,300 00
Dr. A. E. McKay.....	Quarantine Officer.....	Halifax.....	1,000 00
Dr. J. D. Graham.....	Asst. Quarantine Officer..	".....	1,800 00
Chas. E. Pye.....	Capt. SS. <i>Minoka</i>	".....	Living Allow. 500 00
G. T. Bates.....	Engineer.....	".....	1,000 00
L. Doyle.....	Mate.....	".....	Living Allow. 180 00
J. Pelham.....	Deckhand.....	".....	900 00
A. Hatter.....	Stoker.....	".....	Living Allow. 180 00
Miss F. Himmelman.....	Matron and Nurse.....	".....	900 00
W. D. Logan.....	Engineer.....	".....	Living Allow. 150 00
Geo. Milley.....	Deckhand.....	".....	600 00
A. Sullivan.....	Orderly.....	".....	150 00
Rev. C. Underwood.....	Chaplain.....	".....	600 00
Rev. D. Edwards.....	".....	".....	100 00
Dr. D. A. Morrison.....	Quarantine Officer.....	Louisburg, N.S.....	100 00
Dr. W. McK. McLeod....	".....	N. Sydney, N.S.....	1,000 00
Jas. L. Fraser.....	Steward.....	".....	1,600 00
Dr. Alex. Ross.....	Medical Officer.....	Charlottetown, P.E.I....	400 00
M. Henry.....	Caretaker.....	Southport, P.E.I.....	1,500 00
Dr. R. C. Ruddick.....	Quarantine Officer.....	St. John, N.B.....	400 00
Miss A. E. Delaney.....	Matron and Nurse.....	".....	2,500 00
F. Hargrove.....	Boatman.....	".....	720 00
J. Ennis.....	Asst. Caretaker.....	".....	600 00
E. T. Kennedy.....	Steward.....	".....	600 00
Dr. J. M. Baxter.....	Quarantine Officer.....	Chatham, N.B.....	600 00
Thos. McFarlane.....	Caretaker.....	".....	400 00
Dr. J. A. Langis.....	Med. Superintendent.....	Lazaretto, Tracadie, N.B.	2,000 00
Rev. Sister A. Sormany..	Superintendent.....	".....	2,000 00
Rev. Arch'n Forsyth....	C. of E. Chaplain.....	".....	200 00
Rev. J. M. Levasseur....	R.C. Chaplain.....	".....	400 00
Jas. Smith.....	Caretaker.....	Prince Rupert, B.C.....	1,080 00
Dr. H. R. Nelson.....	Quarantine Officer.....	William Head, Victoria, B.C.....	3,500 00
Dr. R. L. Fraser.....	Insp. Physician.....	".....	200 00
P. O. Gray.....	Steward.....	".....	1,320 00
T. Riley.....	Capt. SS. <i>Madge</i>	".....	1,620 00
J. Tumilty.....	Chief Engineer.....	".....	1,560 00
J. Tracey.....	Asst. Engineer.....	".....	1,440 00
J. E. Cornwall.....	Electrician.....	".....	1,440 00
G. Hansen.....	Launchman.....	".....	1,320 00
C. Corbett.....	Fireman.....	".....	900 00
P. Murphy.....	Deck-hand.....	".....	780 00
Fred L. Tyrrell.....	".....	".....	780 00
C. Lucas.....	Cook.....	".....	840 00
G. Hopkins.....	Cabin-boy.....	".....	480 00
Miss M. M. Blankenbach	Teacher.....	".....	240 00
H. F. S. Hooper.....	Orderly.....	".....	1,080 00
F. Rhode.....	".....	".....	1,020 00
A. Bennard.....	".....	".....	1,080 00
J. Hawkins.....	".....	".....	1,080 00
W. E. Hawkins.....	".....	".....	600 00
			less \$33.31
			mil. pay
H. T. McKee.....	Guardian.....	D'Arcy Island, Victoria..	1,320 00
S. Shelton.....	Asst. Guard.....	".....	900 00
Dr. L. N. McKechnie....	Insp. Physician.....	Vancouver, B.C.....	400 00
C. A. L. Fisher.....	Medical Insp.....	251 Melville Ave., West- mount, P.Q.....	1,700 00
Dr. A. E. Clendenan....	".....	Edmonton, Alta., P.O. Box 579.....	1,700 00
Dr. G. E. Martineau....	Med. Superintendent.....	Grosse Isle.....	3,500 00
Dr. W. W. Ayles.....	Asst. Med. Superintendent	".....	3,000 00
Dr. J. J. Heagerty.....	Med. Asst. and Bact.....	".....	2,750 00

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

LIST OF EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC HEALTH BRANCH—*Concluded*
DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION, AND SALARIES—*Concluded*

Name	Rank	Address	Amount of salary
			\$ cts.
J. Lavallee.....	Captain.....	Grosse Isle.....	1,023 75
E. Smith.....	Steward and Int.....	".....	1,087 50
Miss S. Wade.....	H. Nurse.....	".....	877 50
D. D. Couillard.....	Capt. SS. <i>Alice</i>	".....	1,023 75
A. Lapointe.....	Chief Engineer.....	".....	1,200 00
J. Roe.....	Engineer.....	".....	960 00
P. Masson.....	Carter.....	".....	1,600 00
V. Bedard.....	Plumber.....	".....	900 00
A. Gendron.....	Asst. Plumber.....	".....	840 00
M. Lynch.....	Gardener.....	".....	600 00
F. Guimond.....	Carpenter.....	".....	720 00
G. Duclos.....	Engineer.....	".....	1,020 00
Z. Desrochers.....	".....	".....	960 00
A. Laliberte.....	".....	".....	1,260 00
J. Hamel.....	Orderly.....	".....	50 00 per month
A. Gamache.....	".....	".....	50 00 "
Miss M. Lindsay.....	Nurse.....	".....	75 00 "
Mrs. M. Murphy.....	".....	".....	50 00 "
Mrs. E. Bolduc.....	Cook.....	".....	40 00 "
Mrs. J. Bernatchez.....	Laundress.....	".....	50 00 "
J. Gaumond.....	Engineer.....	".....	65 00 "
Em. Fortin.....	1st Mate SS. <i>Alice</i>	".....	90 00 "
G. Duval.....	Quartermaster.....	".....	55 00 "
A. Guimont.....	Seaman.....	".....	53 33 "
H. Buteau.....	".....	".....	53 33 "
J. Lachance.....	".....	".....	53 33 "
X. Caron.....	".....	".....	53 33 "
A. Dube.....	Temporary Engineer.....	".....	80 00 "
O. Metivier.....	Oiler.....	".....	55 00 "
A. Tanguay.....	Stoker.....	".....	50 00 "
A. Blondeau.....	".....	".....	50 00 "
W. Roy.....	".....	".....	50 00 "
E. Aubert.....	Steward.....	".....	60 00 "
J. Laberge.....	Asst. Steward.....	".....	50 00 "
J. Guimond.....	Waiter.....	".....	25 00 "
J. Gange.....	Cook.....	".....	55 00 "
Ph. Cloutier.....	Clerk.....	".....	87 50 "
J. Masson.....	Baker.....	".....	60 00 "
H. Carbonneau.....	2nd Mate SS. <i>Polana</i>	".....	80 00 "
J. Pruneau.....	Quartermaster.....	".....	55 00 "
P. Mercier.....	Seaman.....	".....	53 33 "
A. Coulombe.....	".....	".....	53 33 "
D. Morency.....	".....	".....	53 33 "
R. Blanchet.....	".....	".....	53 33 "
P. Collard.....	Oiler.....	".....	55 00 "
S. Matte.....	Stoker.....	".....	50 00 "
E. Guillemette.....	".....	".....	50 00 "
P. Vezina.....	".....	".....	50 00 "
E. Belanger.....	Steward.....	".....	60 00 "
H. Lyonnais.....	Asst. Steward.....	".....	50 00 "
A. Gagnon.....	Waiter.....	".....	25 00 "
P. Gagne.....	Cook.....	".....	55 00 "
J. Jacques.....	Asst. Engineer.....	".....	80 00 "
F. Fortier.....	Stoker.....	".....	50 00 "
L. Mercier.....	".....	".....	50 00 "
E. Noel.....	Sergeant.....	".....	80 00 "
J. E. Fournier.....	Constable.....	".....	55 00 "
Dr. Edgar Douglas.....		Halifax, N.S.....	1,200 00
Dr. John Rankine.....		".....	1,200 00
Dr. A. McD. Morton.....		".....	1,200 00
Dr. M. T. McLean.....		North Sydney, N.S.....	1,000 00
Dr. W. L. Ellis.....		St. John, N.B.....	1,600 00
D. J. D. Page.....	Med. Officer and Immi- gration Agent.....	Quebec.....	4,000 00
Dr. E. Nadeau.....		".....	2,400 00
Dr. Henri Laurin.....		".....	2,000 00
Dr. D. Gurd.....		Montreal.....	1,500 00
Dr. E. Beauchamp.....		".....	1,500 00
Dr. R. T. Rutherford.....		New York.....	3,000 00
Dr. G. W. Elliott.....		Portland, Me.....	3,000 00
Dr. A. S. Munro.....		Vancouver.....	1,600 00
Dr. G. L. Milne.....		Victoria.....	2,000 00
Dr. Neil M. McNeil.....		Prince Rupert.....	1,600 00
Dr. P. H. Bryce.....	Chief Medical Officer.....	Ottawa.....	4,000 00

R.S.C. CHAPTER 90

4. The duties and powers of the Minister administering the Department of Health shall extend to and include all matters and questions relating to the promotion or preservation of the health of the people of Canada over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction, and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, particularly the following matters and subjects:—

- (a) Co-operation with the provincial, territorial, and other health authorities with a view to the co-ordination of the efforts proposed or made for preserving and improving the public health, the conservation of child life and the promotion of child welfare;
- (b) The establishment and maintenance of a national laboratory for public health and research work;
- (c) The inspection and medical care of immigrants and seamen, and the administration of marine hospitals;
- (d) The supervision, as regards the public health, of railways, boats, ships and all other methods of transportation;
- (e) The supervision of federal public buildings and offices with a view to conserving and promoting the health of the civil servants and other Government employees therein;
- (f) The enforcement of any rules or regulations made by the International Joint Commission, promulgated pursuant to the treaty between the United States of America and His Majesty relating to boundary waters and questions arising between the United States of America and Canada, so far as the same relate to public health;
- (g) The administration of the Acts mentioned in the Schedule to this Act, and of all orders and regulations passed or made under any of the said Acts;
- (h) Subject to the provisions of the Statistics Act, the collection, publication and distribution of information relating to the public health, improved sanitation and the social and industrial conditions affecting the health and lives of the people;
- (i) Such other matters relating to health as may be referred to the Department by the Governor in Council. 1919, c. 24, s. 4.

Privy Council
Canada

P.C. 16/1232

CERTIFIED to be a true copy of a Minute of a Meeting of the Treasury Board, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the 25th June, 1927.

Health:

The Board had under consideration the following memorandum from the Civil Service Commission, submitted by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment:—

"As provided in Subsection 2 of Section 9 of the Civil Service Act of 1918 as amended, the Civil Service Commission, on the recommendation of the Department of Health, submits the following report for approval:—

It is recommended that the organization of the Department of Health be changed by the addition of the following positions to the establishment of the Department, effective from June 1, 1927:

- 1 Medical Officer, Grade 3, Overseas.
- 4 Medical Officers, Grade 2, Overseas.
- 20 Medical Officers, Grade 1, Overseas.

The Department having adopted a policy of medical inspection for intending emigrants from the continent of Europe, including Great Britain and Ireland, the above new positions are required to provide for the appointment of Medical Officers at various centres in those countries.

As provided in Subsection 1 of Section 45B of the Civil Service Act of 1918 as amended, the Civil Service Commission, on the recommendation of the Department of Health, submits the following new classes for approval:—

Medical Officer, Grade 1, Overseas.

Compensation:

Annual: \$3,000; \$3,120; \$3,240; \$3,360; \$3,480.
Living Allowance: \$660 annual.

Medical Officer, Grade 2, Overseas.

Compensation:

Annual: \$3,540; \$3,720; \$3,900; \$4,080.
Living Allowance: \$780 annual.

Medical Officer, Grade 3, Overseas.

Compensation:

Annual: \$4,080; \$4,260; \$4,440; \$4,620.
Living Allowance: \$900 annual.

It is recommended that the foregoing rates of compensation be made effective from June 1, 1927.

These new classes are required to provide classification for the staff of Overseas Medical Inspecting Officers referred to previously in this report."

The Board concur in the above report and recommendation, and submit the same for favourable consideration.

(Signed) E. J. LEMAIRE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable
the Minister of Health.

STATEMENT showing Immigration of Adult Male Farmers and Female Domestic Servants from the Continent of Europe, by Nationalities, for the Seven Fiscal Years ended March 31, 1927

—	1920-21		1921-22		1922-23		1923-24		1924-25		1925-26		1926-27		Totals	
	Adult male farmers	Female domestic servants														
Albanian.....							4		2		10		11		27	1
Austrian.....		2	1	1	5	2	42	4	36	6	50	8	346	28	480	51
Belgian.....	485	73	122	29	101	28	685	77	474	70	444	34	1,012	40	3,323	351
Bohemian.....											4	14			18	
Bulgarian.....						2	174	11	46	5	6	3	42	9	268	30
Croatian.....											964	8	1,009	13	1,973	21
Czecho-Slovak.....	35	28	37	16	52	9	2,124	62	1,977	52	611	23	521	37	4,957	227
Dalmatian.....											1				1	
Dutch.....	209	15	88	6	62	11	696	33	817	61	594	39	745	46	3,211	211
Estonian.....					4		20	7	22	7	10	7	60	21	116	42
Finnish.....	77	66	81		914	94	4,448	551	1,910	703	888	271	2,804	873	11,605	2,650
French.....	173	38	74	22	42	22	109	32	84	30	134	34	156	35	772	213
German.....	12	8	14	22	45	48	788	288	1,126	266	2,418	743	5,839	986	10,242	2,361
Greek.....	11	10	4	35	21	37	66	78	50	64	29	50	131	46	312	320
Hebrew.....	117	167	755	768	279	338	561	720	467	646	285	602	399	621	2,863	3,862
Herzegovinian.....													3		3	
Hungarian.....		2	6	4	6	5	203	26	627	58					842	95
Italian.....	423	131	379	127	644	61	4,060	234	1,080	217	494	184	1,661	209	8,741	1,163
Jugo-Slav.....	7	10	32	22	42	22	861	44	1,087	60	1,440	16	1,909	44	5,378	218
Latvian.....					1		4	3	5	7					10	10
Lettish.....							2	1	2		6		5	29	39	26
Lithuanian.....			5		35	6	122	85	43	43	78	48	635	109	918	241
Luxemburg.....	6		2		1		54	7	24	1					87	8
Magyar.....											3,283	87	3,470	203	6,753	290
Montenegrin.....												5			5	
Moravian.....												1	26	2	31	3
Polish.....	225	262	488	359	847	421	1,421	1,010	1,014	776	1,756	253	5,054	557	10,805	3,638
Portuguese.....										1		1	2	2	2	4
Romanian.....	69	65	160	64	102	57	770	138	1,303	163	127	28	204	20	2,738	535
Russian.....	132	32	88	33	61	15	1,093	423	1,654	160	340	59	553	78	3,921	800
Ruthenian.....											3,194	445	7,829	1,034	11,023	1,479
Scandinavian—																
Danish.....	240	27	370	30	261	22	948	45	1,081	114	694	87	1,385	113	4,979	438
Icelandic.....	11	11	13	1	10	1	8	6	12	4	15	6	7	4	76	33
Norwegian.....	161	32	269	35	301	38	1,251	88	1,193	164	603	95	2,004	192	5,782	644
Swedish.....	331	57	263	45	669	73	2,214	181	1,225	160	768	130	1,754	244	7,224	890
Serbian.....											428	11	823	9	1,251	20
Slovak.....											1,891	17	3,870	60	5,761	77
Spanish.....	10	1			1	2	7	2		1	4	2	5	1	27	9
Swiss.....	94	18	76	20	70	15	932	69	305	69	174	32	344	46	1,995	269
Turkish.....	1					2	3	6	4	12	1	4		3	10	27
Ukrainian.....	76	6	26	12	13	5	316	135	10	3				441	160	
Totals.....	3,403	1,071	3,338	1,732	4,589	1,336	23,986	4,316	17,280	3,923	21,749	3,333	42,662	5,706	119,007	21,417

No. 3 of "Productions" calls for a statement of expenditures, the question being: "What is the ratio between the actual amount expended on colonization and the total amount expended in the administration of the Department at the present time?"

The figures hereunder give the total expenditure by the Department of Immigration and Colonization for the calendar year 1927, also the expenditure during the same period by the Land Settlement Branch.

It must be recognized that in the classification of expenditure it is impossible always to draw the line accurately between administration, immigration and colonization.

	Dept. I. and C. Land Settlement Branch	
Administration	\$ 333,584 65	
Immigration	766,006 13	
Colonization	895,527 17	\$595,000
Inspectional	726,687 60	
Deportation	72,564 20	
Chinese	62,058 43	
Distressed Canadian	1,540 83	
St. John Building	20,970 02	
Total	\$2,878,939 03	\$595,000

Paragraph No. 4 of "Productions" as given in the list supplied by the Clerk of the Committee, asks for the current Agreement with the Railway Companies. This information is published on pages 29, 30 and 31 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of March 8, 1918. In the printing the original Agreement should have appeared first and the renewal second.

No. 5 of "Productions" calls for Railway Companies' placements. The tables hereunder show the total movement of Continental immigrants in 1926 and 1927, classified by males, females, children and domestics according to the country from which they came. The bulk of these were placed by the Railway Companies though numbers were placed by the Department through the Division Commissioner of Immigration at Winnipeg and through the Land Settlement officials.

1926

Nationality	Souls	Males	Females	Children	Domestics
Austria	439	386	39	14	14
Czecho-Slovakia	5,739	5,320	203	116	78
Danzig					
Estonia	57	42	14	1	10
Germany	1,801	1,199	325	277	121
Hungary	4,365	3,538	408	419	89
Jugo-Slavia	4,690	4,323	214	153	51
Latvia	51	26	16	9	11
Lithuania	701	576	100	25	74
Poland	13,001	10,782	1,528	691	955
Roumania	1,628	1,206	228	194	70
Russia	5,556	1,481	1,336	2,739	74
Totals	38,028	28,979	4,411	4,638	1,547

1927

Nationality	Souls	Males	Females	Children	Domestics
Austria.....	1,255	1,059	130	66	60
Czecho-Slovakia.....	5,870	5,320	352	198	209
Danzig.....	91	35	19	37	3
Esthonia.....	79	51	26	2	22
Germany.....	29	21	5	3
Hungary.....	4,048	3,129	463	456	131
Jugo-Slavia.....	4,224	3,656	311	257	90
Latvia.....	55	33	17	5	12
Lithuania.....	874	679	159	36	117
Poland.....	17,596	13,136	2,854	1,606	1,707
Roumania.....	2,763	2,042	384	337	130
Russia.....	1,729	593	423	713	51
Totals.....	38,613	29,754	5,143	3,716	2,532

STATEMENT SHOWING OCCUPATIONS OF IMMIGRANTS FROM THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE, FOR THE SEVEN FISCAL YEARS ENDED MARCH 31, 1927

	1920-1921	1921-1922	1922-1923	1923-1924	1924-1925	1925-1926	1926-1927	Totals
Farming class—								
Males.....	3,403	3,338	4,589	23,986	17,280	21,749	44,662	119,007
Females.....	858	1,299	1,153	2,780	3,165	2,209	3,110	14,574
Children.....	674	732	658	2,341	3,284	4,067	6,105	17,861
Labouring class—								
Males.....	2,821	1,654	678	4,053	2,695	507	2,033	14,441
Females.....	414	403	108	278	291	100	161	1,755
Children.....	187	265	67	249	329	162	491	1,750
Mechanics—								
Males.....	2,069	1,108	376	1,800	1,340	668	1,246	8,607
Females.....	572	572	194	327	412	334	555	2,966
Children.....	233	193	67	200	265	271	409	1,638
Trading class—								
Males.....	603	492	113	666	552	390	493	3,309
Females.....	163	244	42	166	210	177	196	1,198
Children.....	85	203	19	55	73	156	198	789
Mining class—								
Males.....	329	50	21	427	109	27	87	1,050
Females.....	44	6	2	18	9	12	91
Children.....	38	3	3	19	4	11	78
Female domestic servants.....	1,071	1,732	1,336	4,316	3,923	3,333	5,706	21,417
Other classes—								
Males.....	1,730	872	413	333	168	305	327	4,148
Females.....	3,166	2,851	1,848	2,592	2,548	2,417	3,085	18,507
Children.....	2,403	2,496	1,521	2,610	2,769	2,587	3,373	17,759
Totals.....	20,863	18,513	13,208	47,216	39,426	39,459	72,260	250,945

No. 7 of "Productions" calls for information about the number of immigrants who went to the Prairie Provinces as farm labourers and the number of such who remained.

The Immigration statistics do not provide the answer to this query there being no compilation made showing occupation by Provincial destination. As it is impossible to keep in touch with the movement of many immigrants once they have landed in Canada, the Department cannot show how many of any particular class or nationality remain in Canada or even in the province to which they were destined at time of arrival.

The only information available is found in the Census reports. The following table has been prepared from these reports showing, (a) immigrants from the British Isles, and (b) immigrants from the Continent of Europe, who

were found resident in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta in June, 1926 when the Census was taken:—

	Immigration before 1911	Immigration 1911-1920	Immigration 1921-June, 1926
(a) BRITISH ISLES:			
Manitoba.. . . .	52,274	38,330	12,385
Saskatchewan	48,026	35,418	13,666
Alberta.. . . .	43,064	37,653	16,185
(b) CONTINENTAL:			
Manitoba.. . . .	51,241	23,352	15,671
Saskatchewan	62,489	33,265	20,755
Alberta.. . . .	37,418	23,872	15,393

No. 8 of "Productions" as given by the Clerk of the Committee calls for a statement of the number of successes under the Land Settlement Scheme. The Committee discussion mentioned the Soldier Land Settlement Scheme.

The following information is a summary of two Schemes:—

- (a) Soldier Settlement.
- (b) The 3,000 British Family Scheme.

The figures of the Soldier Settlement Board are as follows:—

Up to January 31:

Total Loan Settlement..	24,480
In adjustment..	8,749
Repaid Loan by selling farm..	455
	9,204
Still on land..	15,276
Loans	15,276
Soldier Grant Entries..	6,469
	21,745
Civilian settlers..	2,523
Still on land by S. S. Act..	24,268

Up to February 29:

3,000 Family Scheme.

Arrivals..	2,632
Withdrawn after being established..	249
Certificates cancelled after arrival..	53
	302
	2,330
In adjustment..	87
Still on land (Families)..	2,243

MEMORANDUM

No. 9 of "Productions" calls for a statement of the number of emigrants from Great Britain and Northern Ireland to Canada, as compared with other parts of the Empire. No period is mentioned. The following table is prepared from British Government publications:—

	Calendar Year 1926	Jan. to Sept. 1927
British North America..	49,632	47,607
Australia..	44,513	29,571
New Zealand..	16,565	5,921
British South Africa..	8,295	5,423
Other British Territory..	13,301	8,568

It will be observed that the above figures do not include migration from the Irish Free States.

As indicating the outward bound movement of British subjects, including those from the Irish Free State, the following table is prepared from the British Board of Trade *Journal* and covers the fiscal years 1926 and 1927:—

	1926	1927
British North America..	73,174	86,058
Australia..	46,212	50,967
New Zealand..	13,609	16,470
British South Africa..	21,864	22,469
Other British Territory..	27,835	28,183

STATEMENT showing Nationality, Sex, Occupation and Destination of Immigrants

	Sex				Occupation								
					Farming Class			Labouring Class			Mechanics		
	M.	F.	C.	Totals	M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.
Austrian.....	3	2		5							1		
Belgian.....	532	647	353	1,532	373	255	231	45	31	19	25	11	7
Bohemian.....		2	1	3		1							
Bulgarian.....	1			1									
Czecho-Slovak.....	1			1									
Dutch.....	64	53	37	154	47	18	17	2		1	3		
Finnish.....	13	23	8	44	9			3	1				
French.....	522	785	277	1,584	187	105	60	28	7	3	91	42	22
German.....	3	7	2	12		1							
Greek.....	19	15	5	39	1			4	2	2	1		
Hebrew.....	28	46	42	116		1	2				4	3	3
Italian.....	310	532	323	1,165	37	20	17	138	101	60	57	26	12
Luxemburg.....	6	5	5	16	4	2					2	1	2
Polish.....	22	25	29	76	6	5	10		1	4	7	2	4
Portuguese.....	2	1		3				2					
Roumanian.....	12	7	2	21	1			1			2	1	
Russian.....	14	27	10	51	4	2	8	1			4	6	1
Scandinavian—													
Danish.....	166	49	18	233	126	16	8	8	1	1	6	1	1
Icelandic.....	4	6	1	11	2						1		
Norwegian.....	86	64	29	179	54	14	13	12	1		5	1	
Swedish.....	135	70	36	241	98	26	20	15			9	1	2
Serbian.....	4	3	5	12	1	1	4						
Spanish.....	13	1	1	15	1			4	1		1		
Swiss.....	42	41	17	100	26	7	8	1	2	1	6	7	1
Turkish.....		1		1									
Totals.....	2,002	2,412	1,201	5,615	977	474	398	264	148	91	225	102	55

Prior to the 9th of May, 1922, a money qualification which varied at different periods, was in effect.

Prior to the date mentioned, there was also a passport regulation and the non-continuous journey regulation.

Exemptions under the money qualification may be summarized as follows:—(a) Farmers, (b) Farm labourers, (c) House hold workers, (d) Relatives of certain degrees.

STATEMENT showing Nationality, Sex, Occupation and Destination of Immigrants

	Sex				Occupation								
					Farming Class			Labouring Class			Mechanics		
	M.	F.	C.	Totals	M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.
Albanian.....	3	2	1	6				1					
Austrian.....	2	16	8	26		1	2						
Belgian.....	708	610	327	1,645	485	234	178	52	17	6	72	43	15
Bulgarian.....		3	1	4									
Czecho-Slovakia.....	190	90	28	308	35	10	9	50	4	2	61	7	
Dutch.....	361	147	87	595	209	49	47	9	3	4	29	13	7
Finnish.....	957	299	145	1,401	575	74	62	151	15	6	19	5	4
French.....	373	343	145	861	173	54	26	26	4	3	56	34	13
German.....	32	71	34	137	12	13	10	12	1		1	4	1
Greek.....	154	137	66	357	11	1	1	52	13	6	35	2	1
Hebrew.....	907	1,086	770	2,763	117	55	45	168	37	23	233	109	66
Hungarian.....	8	12	3	23		1		1			2	1	
Italian.....	2,492	946	442	3,880	423	70	27	1,436	219	85	288	49	11
Jugo-Slavia.....	31	40	18	89	7	2	4	5	4	2	5	4	2
Luxemburg.....	11	3	2	16	6	3	2	4			1		
Polish.....	1,683	1,414	964	4,061	225	87	81	315	55	31	639	187	76
Portuguese.....		3	1	4									
Roumanian.....	342	392	235	969	69	47	33	65	14	7	63	56	18
Russian.....	764	210	103	1,077	132	25	31	101	11	4	297	36	12
Scandinavian—													
Danish.....	379	84	48	511	240	31	27	54	2		25	2	
Icelandic.....	19	17	14	50	11	1	3	1			1		
Norwegian.....	252	118	59	429	161	47	37	38	2	3	9	3	2
Swedish.....	516	137	62	715	331	35	39	87	5		43	3	1
Spanish.....	179	12	11	202	10	1		109	5	5	7	1	1
Swiss.....	154	61	20	235	94	14	5	6	3		19	4	1
Turkish.....	6		2	8	1			1			1		
Ukrainian.....	432	35	24	491	76	3	5	77			163	9	2
Totals.....	10,955	6,288	3,620	20,863	3,403	858	674	2,821	414	187	2,069	572	233

Prior to the 9th of May, 1922, a money qualification which varied at different periods, was in effect.

Prior to the date mentioned, there was also a passport regulation and the non-continuous journey regulation.

Exemptions under the money qualification may be summarized as follows:—(a) Farmers, (b) Farm labourers, (c) Household workers, (d) Relatives of certain degrees.

from the Continent of Europe, for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1920.

Occupation								Destination									
Trading Class			Mining Class			Female Dom. Servants	Other Classes			Mari-time Provinces	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	Y.T.
M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.		M.	F.	C.								
							2	2			3	1	1				
8	5	0	20	7	1	51	61	287	89	52	273	337	338	324	135	73	
							1	1	1			3					
							1				1	1					
3	3						8	9	24	19	18	12	31	22	19	6	
							7	1	13	8	3	4	25	3	2	46	
39	10	2	15	6	6	44	162	571	184	71	650	271	180	126	171	115	
							1	3	5	2		5	1	2	3		
							1	9	12	3		20	11		8		
4	7	3					17	35	34	2	42	61	1		7	3	
11	7	4	12	4	1	41	55	336	233	18	278	609	26	18	110	106	
							1		3					1	7		
3	4	1					2	6	11	10		19	32	1	22	1	
							1	1	1		2	4	1		1		
1	1						2	6	3	2		8	4	5	1	3	
2							1	3	18	1	5	14	10	6	10	2	
8							17	18	14	8	11	26	27	60	53	45	
							2	1	4	1				11			
3	1						25	12	22	16	2	6	17	22	65	49	
1			2				29	10	14	14	13	13	33	25	57	60	
								1	2	1		3		6		2	
2								5	1	1		8	2	2		1	
2	1	1					9	7	15	6	1	24	13	11	21	9	
								1				1					
96	39	13	49	17	8	241	391	1,391	636	198	1,411	1,494	721	721	668	398	

In addition to the exemptions, numbers of others were admitted who did not come within the regulations. The largest class of persons so admitted were relatives and friends of people already established in Canada. To separate those who came within the regulations from others admitted would require detailed examination of individual manifests, detention sheets, cards and thousands of individual files. Admissions were made on the authority of the head of the Department.

from the Continent of Europe, for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1921

Occupation								Destination											
Trading Class			Mining Class			Fem. Dom. Servs.	Other Classes			N.S.	N.B.	P.E.I.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	Y.T.
M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.		M.	F.	C.										
							2	2	1			2	4						
							2	12	6	1		7	5	3	6	4			
11	9	2	29	11	8	73	59	228	118	86	3	327	646	318	103	122	40		
								3	1				4						
8	1						28	36	40	17	8	95	122	10	34	36	3		
12	6	2	64	1			15	38	60	27	73	1	60	212	69	55	104	21	
4	4		8	1			77	200	123	73	2	133	1,121	13	14	57	59		
14	6		30	15	20		38	74	192	83	95	2	335	1,133	100	80	72		
1	2						8	6	43	23		2	25	23	22	47	15	5	
15	8	1	3				10	38	103	57	2	123	198	4	2	14	12		
107	37	15					167	282	681	621	26	29	879	1,531	152	83	54	9	
1	1	1					2	4	7	2			14	4		5			
29	6	3	132	12	5	131	184	459	311	175	22	606	2,320	94	45	244	371		
1			3				10	10	20	10	3		9	53	5	10	5	4	
													5		2	9			
190	40	32	6	2	3	262	308	781	741	30	15	1,128	2,214	239	279	134	22		
								3	1										
58	27	25	1				65	86	183	152	3	5	514	173	75	162	37		
75	10	4	3				32	156	96	52	8	10	623	275	51	64	29	17	
11			1				27	48	22	21	22	17	93	68	93	85	116	17	
3							11	3	5	11			1		33	9	6	1	
3	1		1	1			32	39	32	17	7	2	23	50	48	122	116	56	
9	2		2				57	44	35	22	9	4	79	156	104	140	123	100	
3			42				1	8	4	5	57	9	84	37	9		1	5	
8	1		3	1	2		18	24	20	12	4		64	58	21	50	23	15	
								3	2				4	3			1		
39	1		1				5	76	17	17	3	2	288	166	19	8	5		
60	3163	85	329	44	38	1,071	1,730	3,166	2,403	614	125	5,530	9,576	1,482	1,408	1,327	801		

In addition to the exemptions, numbers of others were admitted who did not come within the regulations. The largest class of persons so admitted were relatives and friends of people already established in Canada. To separate those who came within the regulations from others admitted would require detailed examination of individual manifests, detention sheets, cards and thousands of individual files. Admissions were made on the authority of the head of the Department.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

STATEMENT showing Nationality, Sex, Occupation and Destination of Immigrants

	Sex				Occupation									
	M.	F.	C.	Totals	Farming Class			Labouring Class			Mechanics			
					M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.	
Albanian.....	5		1	6				3						
Austrian.....	2	6	6	14	1	2	4							
Belgian.....	180	199	124	503	122	67	49	11	2	2	13	10	1	
Bulgarian.....		16	11	27		1	2		1					
Czecho-Slovak.....	57	68	27	152	37	24	8	11	1	2	4	2		
Dutch.....	107	52	24	183	88	11	11	2			6	2		
Finnish.....	94	136	44	274	66	9	14	15	2	4	7	4	1	
French.....	140	158	34	332	74	31	9	9	4	1	13	11	2	
German.....	40	96	42	178	14	6	3	9	3	5	6	3		
Greek.....	54	117	38	209	4	1		15	1	1	6			
Hebrew.....	3,163	3,191	2,050	8,404	755	250	172	616	172	145	819	477	169	
Hungarian.....	13	24	11	48	6	6	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	
Italian.....	1,362	697	354	2,413	379	29	12	717	133	75	140	19	2	
Jugo-Slav.....	48	77	55	180	32	22	23	9	1			2		
Lithuanian.....	11	6	2	19	5	3	2	5	2					
Luxemburg.....	2	3		5	2	2						1		
Polish.....	661	1,420	626	2,707	488	531	198	89	57	11	30	20	7	
Roumanian.....	246	330	183	759	160	141	88	39	14	10	22	7	1	
Russian.....	131	120	70	321	88	45	35	19	4	6	10	8	6	
Scandinavian—														
Danish.....	421	85	35	541	370	23	20	29	1		7	1		
Icelandic.....	18	7	6	31	13	4	3	2						
Norwegian.....	306	105	69	480	269	34	31	15	1		8	2	1	
Swedish.....	297	101	44	442	263	27	22	22	1	2	7	2	2	
Spanish.....	4	2		6							1			
Swiss.....	113	55	19	187	76	15	12	7			7			
Turkish.....	2	1		3										
Ukrainian.....	37	35	17	89	26	15	11	6	1		1			
Totals.....	7,514	7,107	3,892	18,513	3,338	1,299	732	1,654	403	265	1,108	572	193	

Prior to the 9th of May, 1922, a money qualification which varied at different periods, was in effect.

Prior to the date mentioned, there was also a passport regulation and the non-continuous journey regulation.

Exemptions under the money qualification may be summarized as follows:—(a) Farmers, (b) Farm labourers, (c) Household workers, (d) Relatives of certain degrees.

STATEMENT showing Nationality, Sex, Occupation and Destination of Immigrants

	Sex				Occupation									
	M.	F.	C.	Totals	Farming Class			Labouring Class			Mechanics			
					M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.	
Albanian.....	1			1										
Austrian.....	5	15	3	23	5	2	1							
Belgian.....	131	135	50	316	101	37	20	3			15	8	3	
Bulgarian.....	5	10	4	19										
Czecho-Slovakia.....	63	33	5	101	52	11	1	4						
Dutch.....	71	40	8	119	62	14	2	4	1	2	4			
Estonian.....	5	5	2	12	4	3	2	1	1					
Finnish.....	965	170	36	1,171	914	43	18	28	1		13	1	1	
French.....	105	138	38	281	42	15	4	14	3	2	12	5	2	
German.....	60	122	34	216	45	21	15	4	1	2	4	5	2	
Greek.....	52	107	18	177	21	1	1	6	1		6	2		
Hebrew.....	796	1,223	774	2,793	279	121	98	63	17	20	182	128	49	
Hungarian.....	6	13	4	23	6	3	1							
Italian.....	1,221	530	323	2,074	644	40	11	431	32	12	89	24	5	
Jugo-Slav.....	55	53	28	136	42	17	16	9						
Latvian.....	1			1	1									
Lithuanian.....	49	36	21	106	25	21	15	9	6	4				
Luxemburg.....	2	1		3	1	1					1			
Polish.....	957	1,367	598	2,921	847	584	251	43	38	22	18	15	2	
Portuguese.....	2			2				1						
Roumanian.....	125	199	103	427	102	61	23	11	3	1	3	2		
Russian.....	72	95	55	222	61	40	28	2	3	1	1	1	1	
Scandinavian—														
Danish.....	281	62	39	382	261	17	22	3			3			
Icelandic.....	10	8	3	21	10	3	1							1
Norwegian.....	339	97	71	507	301	36	57	16			9	1	1	
Swedish.....	703	148	97	948	669	41	59	19			7	1		
Spanish.....	5	8	2	15	1			2			1	1		
Swiss.....	87	51	14	152	70	14	10	3			3			
Turkish.....	1	2		3							1			
Ukrainian.....	16	15	5	36	13	7	2	2	1	1				
Totals.....	6,190	4,683	2,335	13,208	4,589	1,153	658	678	108	67	376	194	67	

MEMORANDUM

On May 9th, 1922, the money requirement was abrogated. British subjects in good health were admitted without any vocational or financial requirements. In practice the same treatment was accorded to residents of the Continent North of the German Line. Later (in 1926) this preferred treatment was extended to Germany.

As to other Continental Countries there were vocational requirements, viz., agriculturists, domestic servants, or relatives of those already in Canada, within a prescribed degree of relationship. In addition to this, numbers were admitted

from the Continent of Europe, for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1922.

Occupation									Destination										
Trading Class			Mining Class			Fem. Dom. Servs.	Other Classes			N.S.	N.B.	P.E.I.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	Y.T.
M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.		M.	F.	C.										
.....	1	2	1	6	
.....	5	3	5	7	2	29	22	86	87	8	1	89	179	112	56	44	15	
.....	16	4	24	17	1	4	12	49	19	27	27	13	
.....	5	1	4	1	6	6	29	9	3	7	57	37	24	38	17	
.....	81	4	39	25	22	202	5	7	12	26	
.....	11	3	22	33	87	22	13	2	119	38	47	60	36	17	
.....	22	10	61	34	3	20	28	33	59	34	1	
.....	5	35	24	80	37	4	51	123	5	4	6	16	
.....	404	209	182	1	768	568	1,315	1,382	143	72	3,606	2,907	1,245	256	126	49	
.....	4	3	11	6	2	12	28	6	
.....	24	6	6	30	2	3	127	72	381	256	58	462	1,355	52	30	201	248	
.....	22	3	30	32	1	6	100	14	34	18	7	
.....	1	16	1	
.....	3	
.....	5	7	1	359	49	446	409	35	8	239	756	778	488	373	30	
.....	11	6	3	1	1	64	13	97	81	3	175	159	68	251	100	3	
.....	1	33	12	29	23	2	3	126	26	46	87	25	6	
.....	
.....	4	30	11	30	15	12	11	48	75	151	65	159	20	
.....	3	2	3	27	4	
.....	3	35	10	33	37	1	1	10	27	68	152	140	80	1	
.....	3	45	2	26	18	2	24	88	74	86	102	64	
.....	1	1	4	2	
.....	9	2	20	14	18	7	3	45	39	23	30	28	19	
.....	2	1	3	
.....	1	1	2	12	3	6	4	9	23	29	14	13	1	
.....	492	244	203	50	6	3	1,732	872	2,851	2,496	287	117	5,101	6,267	2,837	1,780	1,490	633	1

In addition to the exemptions, numbers of others were admitted who did not come within the regulations. The largest class of persons so admitted were relatives and friends of people already established in Canada. To separate those who came within the regulations from others admitted would require detailed examination of individual manifests, detention sheets, cards and thousands of individual files. Admissions were made on the authority of the head of the Department.

from the Continent of Europe, for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1923.

Occupation									Destination										
Trading Class			Mining Class			Fem. Dom. Servs.	Other Classes			N.S.	N.B.	P.E.I.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	Y.T.
M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.		M.	F.	C.										
.....	2	11	2	1	1	
.....	1	1	28	11	61	27	3	61	127	58	48	9	10	
.....	2	5	8	4	1	12	6	
.....	1	9	2	13	4	1	24	25	5	23	17	6	
.....	2	11	2	14	4	9	40	20	7	37	6	
.....	3	
.....	2	1	94	8	31	17	3	33	978	12	18	49	78	
.....	2	2	22	35	91	29	34	10	113	49	27	25	17	6	
.....	1	1	48	6	46	15	13	36	14	81	65	7	
.....	6	5	37	14	65	17	2	32	112	5	9	5	12	
.....	65	29	15	338	207	590	592	36	30	1,017	1,076	301	173	115	45	
.....	5	3	1	2	1	18	
.....	17	1	2	16	1	61	24	371	293	35	2	476	1,142	61	23	153	182	
.....	22	4	14	12	9	44	9	62	3	9	
.....	6	4	3	2	7	76	15	5	1	2	
.....	1	
.....	2	421	46	309	323	12	8	236	880	781	542	426	36	
.....	
.....	1	57	6	76	79	42	129	42	104	102	8	
.....	1	2	1	15	7	34	24	5	1	6	22	50	103	29	6	
.....	
.....	3	22	11	23	17	18	17	32	66	80	40	107	22	
.....	3	1	13	7	
.....	3	1	1	1	38	9	20	12	3	1	18	25	43	132	179	106	
.....	1	3	1	73	4	33	37	5	3	40	213	153	181	136	217	
.....	9	1	
.....	1	1	1	15	6	20	4	5	49	23	12	33	20	10	
.....	5	2	2	3	
.....	5	1	2	2	2	8	6	14	5	1	
.....	113	42	19	21	2	3	1,336	413	1,848	1,521	161	83	2,301	5,033	1,699	1,699	1,486	776

from the Continent who did not come within the regulations or practice above set out. The largest classes of persons so admitted were a quota for Jewry and relatives and friends of people already established in Canada.

To separate those who come within the regulations and practice from the others admitted would require detailed examination of individual manifests, detention sheets, and thousands of individual files. Admissions were made on the authority of the head of the Department.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

STATEMENT showing Nationality, Sex, Occupation and Destination of Immigrants

	Sex				Occupation												
	M.	F.	C.	Totals	Farming Class			Labouring Class			Mechanics						
					M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.				
Albanian.....	7			7	4			1									
Austrian.....	50	19	13	82	42	8	3										
Belgian.....	866	511	285	1,662	685	225	110	47	7	12		82	19	13			
Bulgarian.....	224	34	9	267	174	9	1	49									
Czecho-Slovak.....	2,577	130	50	2,757	2,124	26	17	432				6					
Dutch.....	861	171	117	1,149	696	64	59	45	9	8		73	12	11			
Estonian.....	25	17	9	51	20	6	5	2	1			1					
Finland.....	5,945	1,262	433	7,640	4,448	320	132	1,049	71	48		374	71	31			
French.....	200	129	41	370	109	15	8	25	5			37	13	5			
German.....	879	599	291	1,769	788	197	194	27	3	3		29	5	4			
Greek.....	102	149	41	292	66	5	3	20	2	3		2	1	2			
Hebrew.....	1,634	1,619	1,002	4,255	561	159	145	292	101	119		382	121	102			
Hungarian.....	231	86	47	364	203	32	28	10	9	12							
Italian.....	4,802	986	591	6,379	4,060	109	77	431	16	4		42	32	6			
Jugo-Slav.....	1,120	120	66	1,306	861	47	40	245	2			1					
Latvian.....	4	6	1	11	4												
Letvian.....	2	4		6	2	3											
Lithuanian.....	126	80	30	236	122	25	15	1	1								
Luxemburg.....	58	20	7	85	54	9	5					2					
Polish.....	1,747	1,887	577	4,211	1,421	528	176	250	9	1		9	1	1			
Roumanian.....	870	408	153	1,431	770	151	66	79	3	5		3					
Russian.....	1,146	977	935	3,058	1,093	457	779	16				17	5	1			
Scandinavian—																	
Danish.....	1,132	136	87	1,355	948	43	47	47	5	2		100	5	1			
Icelandic.....	13	10	4	27	8	2	2	2				1					
Norwegian.....	2,092	211	121	2,424	1,251	46	63	519	14	10		224	9	6			
Swedish.....	2,945	374	217	3,536	2,214	89	96	388	13	13		237	13	7			
Spanish.....	30	7	2	39	7	1		19									
Swiss.....	1,236	211	138	1,585	932	61	80	49	7	4		171	19	10			
Turkish.....	7	17	3	27	3	4	2	1				2	1				
Ukrainian.....	331	297	204	832	316	139	188	7				2					
Totals.....	31,262	10,477	5,474	47,213	23,986	2,780	2,341	4,053	278	249		1,799	327	200			

MEMORANDUM

On May 9th, 1922, the money requirement was abrogated. British subjects in good health were admitted without any vocational or financial requirements. In practice the same treatment was accorded to residents of the Continent North of the German Line. Later (in 1926) this preferred treatment was extended to Germany.

As to other Continental Countries there were vocational requirements, viz., agriculturists, domestic servants, or relatives of those already in Canada, within a prescribed degree of relationship. In addition to this, numbers were admitted

from the Continent of Europe, for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1922.

Occupation									Destination										
Trading Class			Mining Class			Fem. Dom. Servs.	Other Classes			N.S.	N.B.	P.E.I.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	Y.T.
M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.		M.	F.	C.										
2														6					
2	1		3	1	1	4	1	5	9	6			20	16	24	10	5		
23	10	2	11	4	4	77	18	169	144	23	9	191	1,201	134	57	32	15		
1						11		14	8	15		19	127	41	30	32	3		
3			5	2	4	62	7	40	29	14	47	1	554	800	1,100	136	84	21	
38	3	1	1			33	8	50	38	11	2	1	108	460	196	107	237	27	
1						7	1	3	4		1		7	14	1	4	2	22	
52	17	2	11	2	1	551	11	230	219	31	19		859	5,939	49	52	96	595	
10	12	6	7	2	2	32	12	50	20	22	5	1	147	106	27	27	18	17	
10	7	1	12	2	3	288	13	97	86	18	1	3	72	441	165	707	327	35	
5	4					78	9	59	33	8	1		43	168	29	17	22	4	
283	72	30				720	116	446	606	27	35	2	1,757	1,480	624	174	120	36	
	3		17			26	1	16	7	1	17		41	120	165	19	1	1	
19	8	5	232			234	18	587	499	292	56	2	858	3,714	360	146	489	462	
3			8			44	2	27	26	12	12		64	420	529	184	32	53	
						3		3	1				2		1	2	5	1	
						1									1	2	1	2	
1			2			35		19	14	12			77	15	103	15	10	4	
2						7		4	2				26	9	4	40	4	2	
8	1		38	2	3	1,010	21	336	396	49	73		424	1,476	1,055	650	442	42	
3	1		8	1		138	7	114	82	21	8		235	365	267	398	128	9	
10	4					423	10	88	153		3		281	74	113	2,479	82	26	
24	6	2				45	13	32	35	46	67		236	253	308	126	287	32	
1						6	1	2						1	22	4			
34	3		50	2	1	88	14	49	41	34	17		314	281	453	463	256	604	
64	6	3	20			181	22	72	98	26	15		479	883	659	347	260	867	
3						2	4	4	2				14	21			2		
64	8	3				69	20	47	41	21	4		432	144	753	106	89	36	
						6	1	6	1				9	18					
						135	6	23	16				21	123	130	505	49	4	
666	166	55	425	18	19	4,316	333	2,592	2,610	689	392	10	7,230	18,600	7,263	6,987	3,135	2,925	2

from the Continent who did not come within the regulations or practice above set out. The largest classes of persons so admitted were a quota for Jewry and relatives and friends of people already established in Canada.

To separate those who come within the regulations and practice from the others admitted would require detailed examination of individual manifests, detention sheets, and thousands of individual files. Admissions were made on the authority of the head of the Department.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

STATEMENT showing Nationality, Sex, Occupation and Destination of Immigrants

	Sex				Occupation										
	M.	F.	C.	Totals	Farming Class			Labouring Class			Mechanics				
					M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.		
Albanian.....	2			2	2										
Austrian.....	38	25	12	75	36	5	5								
Belgian.....	618	427	255	1,300	474	150	86	29	7	3	71	32	17		
Bulgarian.....	47	19	3	69	46	2						1			
Czecho-Slovak.....	1,852	156	76	2,084	1,577	19	15	271							
Dutch.....	1,029	316	292	1,637	817	104	118	40	6	3	110	22	31		
Estonian.....	23	21	5	49	22	10	5								
Finnish.....	2,620	1,262	379	4,261	1,910	170	78	506	27	20	161	25	7		
French.....	166	125	35	326	84	21	11	16	1		40	15	2		
German.....	1,174	638	403	2,215	1,126	201	234	19	6	4	18	3	1		
Greek.....	73	125	39	237	50	8	6	3	2	1	3	2			
Hebrew.....	1,651	1,655	1,153	4,459	467	162	183	553	182	254	43	255	159		
Hungarian.....	643	224	185	1,052	627	102	103	12	1	1	1		2		
Italian.....	1,269	652	428	2,349	1,080	52	45	125	15	10	27	7	4		
Jugo-Slav.....	1,247	224	149	1,620	1,087	118	106	156	1			1			
Latvian.....	5	14	1	20	5	5									
Lettish.....	2			2	2										
Lithuanian.....	49	62	14	125	43	9	2	3							
Luxemburg.....	25	6	4	35	24	4	2				1				
Polish.....	1,047	1,252	435	2,734	1,014	192	138	16	6	4	4	1			
Portuguese.....		3		3											
Roumanian.....	1,430	428	198	2,056	1,303	147	97	60	2	4	7				
Russian.....	1,678	1,734	1,999	5,411	1,654	1,448	1,769	8			2	3	3		
Scandinavian—															
Danish.....	1,393	275	162	1,830	1,081	70	75	101	6	8	142	10	15		
Icelandic.....	22	13	14	49	12	4	7	2			7	3	3		
Norwegian.....	1,965	357	228	2,550	1,193	64	89	484	17	11	241	9	9		
Swedish.....	1,622	343	173	2,138	1,225	63	64	256	6	5	101	9	7		
Spanish.....	2	1		3											
Swiss.....	435	173	72	680	305	30	39	32	5	1	59	14	5		
Turkish.....	5	16	8	29	4	2	6	1							
Ukrainian.....	12	12	2	26	10	3	1	2	1						
Totals.....	22,144	10,558	6,724	39,426	17,280	3,165	3,284	2,695	291	329	1,340	412	265		

MEMORANDUM

On May 9th, 1922, the money requirement was abrogated. British subjects in good health were admitted without any vocational or financial requirements. In practice the same treatment was accorded to residents of the Continent north of the German Line. Later (in 1926) this preferred treatment was extended to Germany.

As to other Continental Countries there were vocational requirements, viz., agriculturists, domestic servants, or relatives of those already in Canada, within a prescribed degree of relationship. In addition to this, numbers were admitted

from the Continent of Europe, for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1922.

Occupation									Destination										
Trading Class			Mining Class			Fem. Dom. Servs.	Other Classes			N.S.	N.B.	P.E.I.	Oue.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	Y.T.
M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.		M.	F.	C.										
						6	1	14	7										
17	11	4	16	4	1	70	11	153	144	12	16	202	881	103	34	42	10		
2	1					5	1	11	3				31	44	17	3	1		
						52		84	61				66	407	1,384	119	89		
55	13	8	2		1	61	5	110	131	16	2	162	801	302	95	212	47		
						7							9	1	1	21	13		
32	29	3	3			703	8	308	271	39	28	705	2,918	48	47	85	391		
16	16	4	1			30	9	42	18	8	2	170	57	15	28	29	17		
6	3					266	4	159	139	8		45	574	264	822	467	34		
10	9	4				64	7	40	28	3		51	118	12	8	18	18		
227	77	35				646	61	333	522	38	15	1,775	1,495	543	226	200	167		
1				4		58	2	63	79	28		6	167	391	372	74	14		
7	4		21		1	217	9	353	368	49	5	457	1,278	194	39	133	194		
2						60	2	44	43	6	4	17	345	885	260	47	56		
						7		2	1	1		3	2	7	6	1			
						43		10	12	1	1	50	17	19	14	19	4		
2			1			1		1	2			20	1	2	8	2	2		
3	2		5			776	5	275	293	31	7	140	670	744	550	540	52		
						1		1	1			2	1						
3	2		2			163	11	113	95	54	1	76	243	805	585	278	14		
8	7		46		1	160	6	116	225		4	60	171	188	4,535	414	39		
61	8	5	1			114	7	67	59	65	50	351	442	497	172	201	47		
1						4		2	4	2			33	2			9		
36	11	4	4			164	7	92	115	61	12	358	289	501	482	276	571		
28	8	2	6		1	160	6	97	94	25	11	292	501	316	216	265	511		
1						1		1	1			3							
34	7					69	5	48	27	3	2	332	100	63	76	50	45		
	1					12		1	2	1		1	27						
						3		5	1					7	5	9			
552	210	73	109	9	4	3,923	168	2,518	2,769	459	167	4	5,357	11,568	7,359	8,742	3,494	2,275	1

from the Continent who did not come within the regulations or practice above set out. The largest classes of persons so admitted were a quota for Jewry and relatives and friends of people already established in Canada.

To separate those who come within the regulations and practice from the others admitted would require detailed examination of individual manifests, detention sheets, and thousands of individual files. Admissions were made on the authority of the head of the Department.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

STATEMENT showing Nationality, Sex, Occupation and Destination of Immigrants

	Sex				Occupation												
				Totals	Farming Class			Labouring Class			Mechanics						
	M.	F.	C.		M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.				
Albanian.....	10	2	2	14	10	1											
Austrian.....	55	16	4	75	50	5	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Belgian.....	504	322	237	1,063	444	138	96	11	3	3	30	15	6				
Bohemian.....	5	3		8	4												
Bulgarian.....	7	26	14	47	6		1		1		1						
Croatian.....	966	25	15	1,006	964	4	8	1			1						
Czech.....	636	91	78	805	611	13	28	25	1	2							
Dalmatian.....	1			1	1												
Dutch.....	664	231	285	1,180	594	92	165	17	2	3	21	5	7				
Esthonian.....	11	13	4	28	10	2	1										
Finnish.....	993	454	170	1,617	888	59	59	52	6	8	34	11	2				
French.....	242	167	89	498	134	26	28	17	4	8	33	27	13				
German.....	2,468	2,175	2,713	7,356	2,418	1,123	2,356	8	4	3	11	5	6				
Greek.....	52	123	42	217	29	3	5	5	2	4	1						
Hebrew.....	1,133	1,402	1,052	3,587	285	76	135	112	31	49	406	225	199				
Italian.....	620	579	439	1,638	494	26	81	81	29	48	19	12	13				
Jugo-Slav.....	1,450	72	82	1,604	1,440	10	41	8	1		1						
Lettish.....	7	11	6	24	2	2											
Lithuanian.....	87	64	14	165	78	8				1	1						
Magyar.....	3,295	409	408	4,112	3,283	157	215	6	1	4	1						
Moravian.....	5	1		6	5												
Polish.....	1,785	466	284	2,535	1,756	85	156	10	5	7	8	5	4				
Portuguese.....	1	2		3							1						
Roumanian.....	140	73	52	265	127	19	27	5		1	1	1					
Russian.....	378	280	267	925	340	118	165	5	2	3	19	9	11				
Ruthenian.....	3,206	681	372	4,259	3,194	90	219	4		2	2	1	1				
Scandinavian—																	
Danish.....	795	202	115	1,112	694	48	51	31		3	26	2					
Icelandic.....	19	17	17	53	15	4	7				1						
Norwegian.....	707	207	158	1,072	603	34	66	41	1	3	29	6	7				
Swedish.....	849	265	220	1,335	768	46	115	30	5	7	15	4	1				
Serbian.....	429	12	7	454	428	1	7	1									
Slovak.....	1,909	75	62	2,046	1,891	8	19	17		1							
Spanish.....	5	7		12	4	1											
Swiss.....	210	81	29	320	174	10	6	10	1	1	5	5	1				
Turkish.....	2	9	6	17	1		3										
Totals.....	23,646	8,570	7,243	39,459	21,749	2,209	4,067	507	100	162	668	334	271				

MEMORANDUM.

On May 9th, 1922, the money requirement was abrogated. British subjects in good health were admitted without any vocational or financial requirements. In practice the same treatment was accorded to residents of the Continent North of the German Line. Later (in 1926) this preferred treatment was extended to Germany.

As to other Continental Countries there were vocational requirements, viz., agriculturists, domestic servants, or relatives of those already in Canada, within a prescribed degree of relationship. In addition to this, numbers were admitted

from the Continent of Europe, for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1926.

Occupation						Destination															
Trading Class			Mining Class			Fem. Dom. Servs.	Other Classes			N.S.	N.B.	P.E. I.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	Y.T.	N. W.T.	
M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.		M.	F.	C.												
		1						1	1			5	2	7							
	6		1			8		1	1	1		4	11	16	27	12					
8						34	10	126	132	3		126	640	174	73	27	12			4	
	2						1	1	1				2	3	1		5			3	
	1					3		21	13				39	1	2		3			5	
						8		13	7				12	948	26	17				3	
						23		54	48	2		30	107	496	73	83	14			14	
													1								
19	4	3				39	13	89	107	2	9	98	468	295	66	163	79				
1						7		4	3			2	1	1	4	13	7				
5	1		3			271	11	106	101	1	5	265	1,074	26	20	48	176		1	1	
18	6	2	4			34	36	70	38	16	3	253	84	34	50	41	11			6	
11	2	6	1			743	19	298	342	5		64	469	1,604	4,495	671	48				
12	7	4				50	5	61	29	2	2	54	98	5	22	10	24				
239	114	120				602	91	354	549	21	19	1,602	1,221	458	112	107	46				
8	12	5	5			184	13	316	292	11	9	253	852	187	57	80	189				
1						16		45	41	3		2	79	1,001	277	200	42				
						5	1	4	6			2	7	4	6	3	2				
6						48	2	8	8			33	16	90	14	8	4				
	1					87	5	163	189	3		39	186	2,255	1,113	507	9				
						1							1	4		1					
4	3	4				253	7	115	113	9		90	199	1,650	241	319	22			5	
						1		1				2	1								
2	1	2				28	5	24	22			21	44	111	69	20					
4	5	3				59	10	87	85	1		77	91	170	164	331	91				
1		1				445	5	145	149	3	1	45	208	2,438	421	1,119	23			1	
24	4	2				87	20	61	59	17	20	168	107	396	122	232	50				
						6	3	7	10			1		37	2	13					
7	3		5			95	22	68	82	4	1	78	91	241	295	203	157				
9	1		8			130	13	80	97	6	15	60	242	288	152	179	391			2	
						11		6				3	16	366	43	20	6				
1		1				17		50	41			29	86	1,536	245	142	8				
						2	1	4				2	5	2	2	1					
9	3					32	12	30	21	1		9	123	48	63	28	20				
1	1	2				4		4	1			7		9			1				
390	177	156	27			3,333	305	2,417	2,587	111	84	12	3,538	6,516	14,908	8,221	4,606	1,446	3	14	

from the Continent who did not come within the regulations or practice above set out. The largest classes of persons so admitted were a quota for Jewry and relatives and friends of people already established in Canada.

To separate those who come within the regulations and practice from the others admitted would require detailed examination of individual manifests, detention sheets, and thousands of individual files. Admissions were made on the authority of the head of the Department.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

STATEMENT showing Nationality, Sex, Occupation and Destination of Immigrants

	Sex				Occupation											
	M.	F.	C.	Totals	Farming Class			Labouring Class			Mechanics					
					M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.			
Albanian.....	13	2	2	17	11			1	1	1						
Austrian.....	349	43	9	401	346	10	5	1							1	
Belgian.....	1,081	530	469	2,080	1,012	221	197	18	5	1	26	18	11			
Bohemian.....	15	4	3	22	14	2	2	1								
Bulgarian.....	72	39	15	126	42	1	2	21						4		
Croatian.....	1,029	30	26	1,085	1,009	3	10	20								
Czech.....	551	93	77	721	521	22	35	26	1	1	2					2
Dutch.....	844	329	501	1,674	745	153	333	24	9	12	39	10	8			
Estonian.....	60	27	5	92	60	3	1									
Finnish.....	3,564	1,224	392	5,180	2,804	124	183	654	19	32	72	28	10			
French.....	262	175	111	548	156	42	39	21	6	6	32	19	5			
German.....	5,965	2,840	3,737	12,540	5,839	1,457	3,227	34	3	74	38	17	9			
Greek.....	169	115	56	340	131	3	3	21	4	2	3					
Hebrew.....	1,617	1,616	1,238	4,471	399	72	142	204	64	179	636	377	293			
Herzegovinian.....	3			3	3											
Italian.....	1,975	650	676	3,301	1,661	48	211	171	25	97	95	25	35			
Jugo-Slav.....	1,910	104	70	2,084	1,909	17	28	1								1
Lettish.....	29	25	6	60	29	4	5									
Lithuanian.....	647	142	53	842	635	18	36	4		1	3					
Magyar.....	3,480	720	663	4,863	3,470	173	235	4	2	9	1	4				
Moravian.....	26	6	4	36	26	1										
Polish.....	5,145	911	449	6,505	5,054	173	240	40	5	12	25	13	10			
Portuguese.....	4	4	6	14	2					1						
Roumanian.....	209	56	27	292	204	17	18			1	1					
Russian.....	585	262	280	1,127	553	97	203	2		7	13	6	4			
Ruthenian.....	7,897	1,440	658	9,995	7,829	156	382	33		10	3	1	1			
Scandinavian—																
Danish.....	1,547	284	199	2,030	1,385	87	129	48	1	2	68	6	7			
Icelandic.....	12	9	9	30	7	3	8	2			1					
Norwegian.....	2,558	422	404	3,384	2,004	95	228	403	14	29	105	11	5			
Swedish.....	1,985	391	252	2,628	1,754	69	157	151	1	11	48	9	2			
Serbian.....	837	24	24	885	823	3	11	13								
Slovak.....	3,962	185	127	4,274	3,870	14	18	92		1						
Spanish.....	10	13	6	29	5	1	2	2		1		1				
Swiss.....	428	105	35	568	344	21	15	21	1	1	29	7	5			
Montenegrin.....	5			5	5											
Turkish.....	3	5		8	1						1					
	48,848	12,825	10,587	72,260	44,662	3,110	6,105	2,033	161	491	1,246	555	409			

MEMORANDUM

On May 9th, 1922, the money requirement was abrogated. British subjects in good health were admitted without any vocational or financial requirements. In practice the same treatment was accorded to residents of the Continent North of the German Line. Later (in 1926) this preferred treatment was extended to Germany.

As to other Continental Countries there were vocational requirements, viz., agriculturists, domestic servants or relatives of those already in Canada, within a prescribed degree relationship, and from the 8th of April, 1926, P.C. 534 provided for the entry of immigrants who satisfied the Minister that their labour or service was required in Canada. This regulation

from the Continent of Europe, for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1922.

Occupation									Destination										
Trading Class			Mining Class			Fem. Dom. Servs.	Other Classes			N.S.	N.B.	P.E.I.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	Y.T.
M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.		M.	F.	C.										
1						1							3	3	9	2			
1						28		5	4				7	45	244	92	12	1	
10	2	3	3	2	2	40	12	242	255	6	1	1	231	1,137	532	107	52	13	
2	2					9	3	27	13					109	16		7	1	
						13		14	16			2		34	52	965	27	4	
						37	1	32	39	6				36	107	383	64	122	
18	5	6				46	18	106	142	3	23			116	640	490	156	111	
						21		3	4					5	12	51	5	15	
	9	2	8		1	873	15	171	164	19	9		1,348	3,051	124	33	82	514	
20	5	3	9	1	2	35	24	67	56	21	4		258	78	42	73	38	34	
23	7					986	31	369	425	15	2		149	665	5,478	5,274	901	61	
9	2	1				46	5	59	50	4	2		43	239	13	23	1	14	
285	124	169				621	93	358	455	52	20	1	1,877	1,739	461	160	94	67	
															3				
10	1		18	4	2	209	20	338	329	51	1		500	1,729	562	53	138	267	
						44		43	40					2	139	1,338	122	431	52
						20		1	1					2	13	29	10	6	
4	2	1				109	1	13	15	3			106	58	533	77	63	2	
1	2	2				203	4	336	417		1		100	551	2,324	1,621	258	8	
						2		3	4					7	28	1			
13	8	1	7	1	1	557	6	154	185	16	4		271	495	4,171	707	812	29	
						2		1	5					7	4	2		1	
						20	4	18	8				19	14	116	122	20	1	
7	5	2				78	10	76	64	1			73	113	378	259	227	76	
1	1	1	24			1,034	7	248	264	30	6	1	262	550	6,081	1,398	1,635	32	
26	6	3	1			113	19	71	58	9	102		281	177	885	215	278	83	
						4	2	2	1						21	9			
18	6		7	1	2	192	21	103	140	18	11	3	360	301	1,026	738	392	535	
8	3		9	1	1	244	15	64	81	4	33		240	501	714	250	239	646	
1						9		12	13				26	52	717	51	32	7	
						60		111	108	3			157	202	2,852	430	604	26	
2	2					1	1	8	2		1		14	2		4	2	6	
19	4	1				46	15	26	13		1		201	90	187	33	30	26	
														1	1		3		
1						3		2					2	4				2	
493	196	198	87	12	11	5,706	3,273	3,085	3,373	266	223	6	6,731	12,880	30,775	12,119	6,609	2,649	2

especially covered immigrants from non-preferred countries whose service was required in Canada, without regard to occupation. In addition to this, numbers were admitted from the Continent who did not come within the regulations and practice above set out. The largest classes of persons so admitted were relatives and friends of people already established in Canada.

To separate those who come within the regulations and practice from the others admitted would require detailed examination of individual manifests, detention sheets, and thousands of individual files. Admissions were made on the authority of the head of the Department.

STATEMENT showing Nationality, Sex, Occupation and Destination of Immigrants

	Sex				Occupation										
	M.	F.	C.	Totals	Farming Class			Labouring Class			Mechanics				
					M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.		
Albanian.....	14	7	4	25	12	1	2
Austrian.....	382	89	40	511	375	17	14	2	1	3	1
Belgian.....	937	474	479	1,890	860	171	182	17	5	9	29	14	9
Bulgarian.....	169	24	11	204	108	2	3	56	1	3	1
Croatian.....	592	57	48	697	591	14	22	1
Czech.....	378	108	75	561	373	15	17	3	6
Dutch.....	909	329	467	1,705	845	154	334	14	3	6	25	6	9
Estonian.....	48	37	9	94	47	4	4	1
Finnish.....	2,529	1,499	334	4,353	1,954	120	120	487	25	34	51	15	2
French.....	431	227	120	778	249	40	28	35	12	7	68	29	8
German.....	5,074	2,299	2,038	9,411	4,528	859	1,459	71	5	38	270	27	14
Greek.....	338	94	39	471	259	4	14	57	3	12	2
Hebrew.....	1,220	1,473	1,052	3,745	214	44	133	164	35	142	548	330	173
Herzegovinian.....	4	4	4
Italian.....	2,026	668	736	3,430	1,581	32	227	247	19	67	157	12	29
Jugo-Slav.....	1,074	107	57	1,238	1,063	25	22	7	2
Lettish.....	30	27	12	69	28	3	5	1
Lithuanian.....	503	226	57	786	490	17	12	4	2	1	1
Magyar.....	3,186	764	724	4,674	3,172	144	197	1	1	9	3
Moravian.....	11	8	11	30	11	3	6
Polish.....	4,148	1,255	744	6,147	4,082	281	423	16	1	7	29	17	10
Portuguese.....	3	2	5	3
Roumanian.....	118	52	33	203	112	15	16	4	1	4	2	3	1
Russian.....	460	205	190	855	429	53	94	7	1	11	15	6	6
Ruthenian.....	5,610	1,911	931	8,452	5,595	276	453	7	17	2	1
Scandinavian—
Danish.....	1,988	518	408	2,914	1,825	130	210	41	3	9	79	16	13
Icelandic.....	12	7	5	24	8	2	2	1	3
Norwegian.....	2,697	650	602	3,949	2,410	174	390	189	8	18	58	16	5
Swedish.....	1,965	420	272	2,657	1,724	64	150	153	8	10	58	6	10
Serbian.....	43	27	366	294	14	14	2
Slovak.....	2,710	318	205	3,233	2,709	49	55	5	1
Spanish.....	11	9	4	24	7	2	2	1
Swiss.....	351	127	63	541	273	28	37	24	1	27	6	2
Turkish.....	2	2	4
Totals.....	40,215	14,036	9,799	64,050	36,235	2,754	4,646	1,615	133	410	1,441	510	292

MEMORANDUM

On May 9th, 1922, the money requirement was abrogated. British subjects in good health were admitted without any vocational or financial requirements. In practice the same treatment was accorded to residents of the Continent North of the German Line. Later (in 1926) this preferred treatment was extended to Germany.

As to other Continental Countries there were vocational requirements, viz., agriculturists, domestic servants or relatives of those already in Canada, within a prescribed degree of relationship, and from the 8th of April, 1926, P.C. 534 provided for the entry of immigrants who satisfied the Minister that their labour or service was required in Canada. This

from the Continent of Europe, for the Ten Months ended January 31, 1928.

Occupation						Destination														
Trading Class			Mining Class			Fem. Dom. Servs.	Other Classes			N.S.	N.B.	P.E.I.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N. W.T.	
M.	F.	C.	M.	F.	C.		M.	F.	C.											
		1				4		3	2				4	5		5				
						39	2	31	26	1			53	43	360	31	10	13		
6	4	3		5		48	20	232	276	19	5		186	1,065	470	69	53	23		
						8		13	7	1			1	192	1	6	2	1		
						14		29	26	1			3	66	591	12	15	9		
				1		51	1	42	52	7			27	89	360	42	27	9		
15	4	1				78	10	84	117	4	49		102	605	518	240	129	58		
						26		7	5				1	14	58	5	13	2	1	
9	10	1		3		1,136	16	193	177	20	9		1,047	2,765	147	23	52	290		
43	12	4		6	2	4	41	30	91	69	31	2	1	433	104	56	67	51	32	1
142	21	8					910	63	477	519	25	11	1	544	819	5,438	1,532	929	112	
8	2						55	2	28	25	7	2		52	323	13	25	5	44	
201	68	85					602	93	394	519	21	13		1,369	1,579	422	155	101	85	
6	2	6		19	3		196	16	404	407	51	5		580	1,809	356	141	141	342	5
							36	4	46	33				12	991	36	38	39		
							17	2	6	5				4	17	38	2	5	3	
				2			165	6	43	43	5			122	75	488	67	27	2	
2	2						187	8	430	518	19			137	596	2,589	982	341	9	1
							3		2	5				13	17					
11	3	7			1		697	10	255	297	22	7		198	619	4,492	495	284	30	
							2							3	1					
							20		13	12				18	35	110	25	14	1	
3	3	1					86	6	56	78	5			105	101	404	127	75	38	
2							1,279	4	356	460	7		1	152	556	5,606	1,184	916	30	
21	6	1					214	22	149	175	34	260	5	428	304	1,203	250	330	100	
1							5	1	1		1			1	20	1				
13	4	7		6			286	21	162	182	11	17	4	273	251	1,565	626	628	574	
12	3			1			245	17	94	102	5	34		325	515	869	232	254	422	1
							14		15	13				2	49	274	25	12	4	
	1						126	1	141	145	4			82	268	2,581	125	138	35	
							1	1	5	2				10	7	2		1	4	
16	4						54	11	35	23	2		1	169	78	195	36	36	24	
							1		1	2				3					1	
512	149	125	43	6	4	6,646	369	3,838	4,322	303	414	13	6,442	13,088	30,250	6,566	4,628	2,337	9	

regulation especially covered immigrants from non-preferred countries whose service was required in Canada, without regard to occupation. In addition to this, numbers were admitted from the Continent who did not come within the regulations and practice above set out. The largest classes of persons so admitted were relatives and friends of people already established in Canada.

To separate those who come within the regulations and practice from the others admitted would require detailed examination of individual manifests, detention sheets, and thousands of individual files. Admissions were made on the authority of the head of the Department.

Total number of immigrants admitted during the ten months ended January 31, 1928, was 13,088. Of this total, 6,646 were admitted from the Continent of Europe, 3,838 from the British Empire, and 2,604 from the United States and possessions. The total number of immigrants admitted during the ten months ended January 31, 1927, was 12,500.

Filed by W. J. Egan, Deputy Minister of Immigration

IMMIGRATION UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE SCOTTISH IMMIGRANT AID SOCIETY, SHOWING MOVEMENT AND COST FROM THE 1ST APRIL, 1922, TO THE END OF NOVEMBER, 1927

(I) Salary and travelling expenses, grants, medical assistance and equipment:—

Fiscal Year	Salary and Expenses	Grants	Medical Assistance and Equipment
1922-23.. . . .	\$ 1,943 53		
1923-24.. . . .	1,472 96	\$ 5,500	\$6,352 27
1924-25.. . . .	4,260 61	6,800	
1925-26.. . . .	3,919 70	5,000	
1926-27.. . . .	4,155 17	5,000	
1927-28.. . . .	2,936 74		
April to Nov.			
	<u>\$18,688 71</u>	<u>\$22,300</u>	<u>\$6,352 27</u>
Total.. . . .			\$ 47,340 98

(II) Settlers:—

The figures given include only those assisted. The Society claims to have moved a number of immigrants who paid their own passage. The number of such is thought to be comparatively small.

Fiscal Year	Adults	Children	Total
1923-24.. . . .	126	165	291
1924-25.. . . .	273	234	507
1925-26.. . . .	32	37	69
1926-27.. . . .	165	193	358
1927-28.. . . .	44	46	90
	<u>640</u>	<u>675</u>	<u>1,315</u>

(III) Passage Assistance and Refunds:—

	Passage Loans	Refunds	Passage Grants
Party, 1923.. . .	\$19,774 85	\$ 202 85	
Party, 1924.. . .	26,992 53	1,439 54	\$ 6,673 42
Party, 1925.. . .	3,224 24	293 35	1,282 36
Party, 1926.. . .	4,049 08	202 79	8,346 40
Party, 1927.. . .	1,177 70		2,304 80
	<u>\$55,218 40</u>	<u>\$2,138 53</u>	<u>\$18,606 98</u>

Total grants and unpaid loans.. . . . \$ 71,686 85

Of the \$53,079.87 passage loans outstanding, as shown in No. (III), one-half of the ultimate loss will be borne by the British Government.

(IV) Assistance was also given through the Land Settlement Branch. A number of those arriving in the earlier parties were settled under the Soldier Settlement Board. All the help granted in that way was by loan and is not included in the figures herein given. The estimated cost of the assistance through the Land Settlement Branch is.. . . . \$ 24,000 00

Grand total.. . . . \$143,027 83

Filed by Witness W. J. Egan

STATEMENT showing number of Repatriation Agents together with the expenditure incurred in connection with the work of Repatriation (especially of French-Canadians) for each fiscal year from 1889-1890 to 1926-27 inclusive.

Fiscal Year	No. of Agents	Total Salaries	Travelling and other Expenses	Grants to Repatriation Societies	Total Expenditure
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—					
		\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1889-1890.....	2	1,400 00	1,080 00		2,480 00
1890-1891.....	4	1,985 00	471 27		2,456 27
1891-1892.....	2		500 00		500 00
1892-1893.....	3	730 00	856 71		1,586 71
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR—					
1893-1894.....	5	725 00	2,414 99		3,139 99
1894-1895.....	6	2,825 00	2,146 93	1,000 00	5,971 93
1895-1896.....	4	2,400 00	869 96		3,269 96
1896-1897.....	4	1,500 90	311 86	2,400 00	4,212 76
1897-1898.....	5	1,491 66	1,028 65	2,000 00	4,520 31
1898-1899.....	5	2,208 26	199 00	1,650 00	4,057 26
1899-1900.....	4	1,400 00	1,035 50	1,950 00	4,385 50
1900-1901.....	3	1,719 43	1,179 61	1,800 00	4,699 04
1901-1902.....	4	2,299 94	986 90	5,900 00	9,186 84
1902-1903.....	4	2,250 00	1,385 79	5,500 00	9,135 79
1903-1904.....	3	2,200 00	1,238 16	9,250 00	12,688 16
1904-1905.....	3	1,819 03	822 36	9,600 00	12,241 39
1905-1906.....	4	2,860 00	2,013 75	10,500 00	15,373 75
1906-1907.....	6	2,740 00	994 94	7,500 00	11,234 94
1907-1908.....	5	3,658 33	4,036 21	5,500 00	13,194 54
1908-1909.....	6	4,950 00	3,981 70	6,500 00	15,431 70
1909-1910.....	7	5,100 00	3,983 32	6,500 00	15,583 32
1910-1911.....	8	6,311 07	4,360 98	6,500 00	17,172 05
1911-1912.....	11	6,061 60	3,134 60	6,500 00	15,696 20
1912-1913.....	10	7,517 14	7,378 67	6,500 00	21,395 81
1913-1914.....	13	10,967 42	10,385 79	6,500 00	27,853 21
1914-1915.....	11	11,976 66	10,753 14	7,500 00	30,229 80
1915-1916.....	13	11,649 25	11,398 44	7,500 00	30,547 69
1916-1917.....	10	9,620 01	10,627 49	4,500 00	24,747 50
1917-1918.....	10	9,604 84	9,883 18	4,500 00	23,988 02
DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION—					
1918-1919.....	8	7,120 52	9,721 78	4,500 00	21,342 30
1919-1920.....	5	4,000 00	9,090 92		13,090 92
1920-1921.....	5	3,780 00	9,796 03		13,576 03
1921-1922.....	6	2,177 41	6,261 29		8,438 70
1922-1923.....	11	3,995 90	10,746 90		14,742 80
1923-1924.....	20	8,544 30	24,986 79		33,531 09
1924-1925.....	22	9,640 00	26,484 09		36,124 09
1925-1926.....	21	9,714 13	27,227 56		36,941 69
1926-1927.....	22	7,766 19	25,996 36		33,762 55
		176,708 99	249,771 62	132,050 00	558,530 61

Filed by Witness J. U. K. Macalister, Assistant Commissioner of Immigration,
Canadian Pacific Railway Company

The following comparative statement showing immigrants brought to Canada under the auspices of the Canadian Pacific from the British Isles and Europe during the year 1927, is submitted as asked by the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization:—

	Males	Females	Children	Total Souls
From British Isles.....	13,355	8,514	4,237	26,106
From so-called Preferred Countries....	6,994	3,096	1,433	11,523
From so-called non-Preferred Countries..	15,024	2,584	1,378	18,986
Total.....				56,615

The foregoing results do not in any sense indicate the money spent or the effort made in the respective districts to obtain colonists.

As stated by me, when before your Committee, our expenditures in colonization activities are very many times greater in the British Isles than on the Continent, in addition, this Company contributes £4.0.0. towards the fare of each British immigrant travelling on our ships under the Empire Settlement Act.

Notwithstanding these efforts and expenditures, we have never been able to obtain the number of single farm labourers from the British Isles for whom we had provided places in Canada.

DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

TABLE

Year	From British Isles	From so-called Preferred Countries	From so-called non-Preferred Countries	Total
1917	10,000	5,000	10,000	25,000
1918	12,000	6,000	12,000	30,000
1919	14,000	7,000	14,000	35,000
1920	16,000	8,000	16,000	40,000
1921	18,000	9,000	18,000	45,000
1922	20,000	10,000	20,000	50,000
1923	22,000	11,000	22,000	55,000
1924	24,000	12,000	24,000	60,000
1925	26,000	13,000	26,000	65,000
1926	28,000	14,000	28,000	70,000
1927	13,355	6,994	15,024	56,615

Filed by Witness W. J. Egan

Memorandum:

In answer to the question submitted by Hon. Dr. Edwards, appearing on Page 188 of Report No. 6 of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, I beg to advise that a search of our files shows that no records of the character requested by Dr. Edwards are in evidence previous to 1924. The Annual Report of the Immigration Branch of the Department of the Interior, as it was then known, for 1903-04 contains the reports of two colonization societies which are apparently operating in conjunction with the Department at that time but these reports give only the number of persons who were repatriated, nothing complete being furnished as to the provinces in which they were settled. What has been said of the societies for 1903-04 is equally applicable to 1904-05, in which year the reports of the Colonization Agents also appear in the annual review of the Department's work. The Annual Report for 1912-13 and also the report for 1913-14 contain reviews of the work by the Colonization Agents but they are by no means complete in their information as to the placement in Canada of those repatriated. Figures are provided of the movement from the other side but this in some cases only.

The report of the Repatriation Agents for 1924 discloses that 333 persons were brought from the United States under their direction, 130 of them being settled in Alberta, 145 in Saskatchewan, 17 in Manitoba and 41 in Ontario.

For the year 1925 the report of the agents gives 383 as the total number of persons repatriated, of whom 235 went to Saskatchewan, 99 to Alberta, 39 to Manitoba and 10 to Ontario.

For 1926 the report stated that approximately 800 French-Canadians, resident in the United States, had been returned to Canada through the efforts of the repatriation staff, classified according to destination by provinces as follows:—

Alberta	361
Saskatchewan	436
Quebec	20
Manitoba	11
Ontario	1

while for 1927 the Repatriation Agents reported having repatriated 966 persons, 22 going to Quebec, 15 to Ontario, 62 to Manitoba, 518 to Saskatchewan and 349 to Alberta.

The Department has all along been endeavouring to bring about provincial co-operation in all matters affecting land settlement, and, the opportunity presenting itself towards the end of last year, an arrangement was completed with the Province of Quebec respecting repatriation. It was then decided to disband the existing repatriation organization.

W. J. EGAN.

Memorandum:

The foregoing memorandum was accepted by the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, when the Hon. Dr. Edwards requested that whatever information we had in connection with the years 1903-04, 1904-05, 1912-13 and 1913-14 should be embodied. This information covers this request.

1903-04

The Colonization Society of Montreal reported 114 persons as having been repatriated from the United States. The report of the Colonization Society of Lake St. John gave the number of persons repatriated from the United States as 1,114.

1904-05

The Montreal Colonization Society reported having repatriated 228 persons from the United States; while the Lake St. John Repatriation and Colonization Society reported 1,076.

1912-13

The three Colonization Agents, whose reports appear in the annual review of the Department, do not give any figures as to the actual number of persons repatriated. Their reports are as follows:—

REPORT OF J. B. H. GIROUX

MONTREAL, April 1, 1913.

The Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa, Ont.

SIR,—During last year, I gave 57 conferences in the United States, principally in the New England States, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maine, Vermont, Michigan, Minnesota. I went four times with settlers to Grouard, Alta.; once to Edmonton to open a new settlement. Homesteads taken from April, 1912, to April, 1913, numbered 118. Besides which 25 homesteads taken near Grouard and Prairie River. I sent 5 to Peace River and Dunvegan, and others to Calgary, Edmonton, Morinville, Vegreville, &c.

My custom is to spend Wednesday, Thursday and Friday at my office in Montreal. On Friday night I usually went to the United States where I stayed until the following Tuesday, and so I succeeded by answering letters, advertising in newspapers and by giving personal interviews. I think I conducted to Alberta over six hundred people, almost all from New England states. However, I secured some from Washington, Dakota and California by correspondence. I issued in the United States, 168 certificates for the settlers' rate.

At present time I notice a great interest in the Eastern States among Canadians desiring to come back to Canada. I let the people make their own choice, and direct them where they want to go.

Your obedient servant,

J. B. H. GIROUX,
Colonization Agent.

REPORT OF J. E. ROBILLARD

LANORAIE, Que., March 31, 1913.

The Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa.

SIR,—I have the honour to submit my annual report for the fiscal year 1912-13 as immigration agent in the New England States district.

In the early part of the year I made a trip through my district covering the following States: Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Maine. You have in my weekly reports all details as to the work I accomplished during my stay there, which lasted fifteen weeks.

The country-bred people with agricultural knowledge and inclinations have a general desire to return to the land. They are no longer fascinated by the factory life and salary and are interested in Canada of to-day. A good many of those I have met are saving money in view of returning to this country. Those who have gone left with good sums of money. I have done my utmost as in the past to make Canada more and better known. It is impossible to give the number of settlers I have been instrumental in bringing to Canada, as one meets them but once generally, and when they decide to go they get their certificates from the nearest residential agent whose name appears on the pamphlets distributed. Allow me to say that the travelling agent sows the seed and the resident agent reaps the harvest.

Last fall I was authorized to make a visit to western Canada, covering Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, but on account of the continued wet weather I had to leave out many places of interest. This trip was of great help in my work, and I cannot thank the department enough in having granted me this favour. I have had the proof that my work has already benefited by it and it cannot but continue.

Correspondence is heavier even than last year, and inquiries this spring are also increasing. The demand for literature continues to increase.

Your obedient servant,

J. E. ROBILLARD,
Colonization Agent.

REPORT OF J. B. L. BOURASSA

306 ST. ANTOINE STREET,
MONTREAL, March 31, 1913.

To the Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa.

SIR,—I beg to submit the report of my work for the year ending March 31, 1913. During the summer months I have devoted my time to visiting our colonization districts, encouraging the newly arrived and accompanying new settlers coming from the eastern United States, where I had delivered lectures during the year. I delivered forty-five of these lectures in the eastern States and six in the province of Quebec. In all cases the attendance was large and very attentive. After my lecture was over, I had to answer many special questions about the country. I must say that through these eastern States I have visited, the majority of the French population is very anxious to come back and see our new settlements in Canada. In my lectures I have called the attention of my audience to the advantages offered in New Ontario, District of Nipissing, Algoma, Northern Timiskaming and County of Timiskaming, P.Q.

The colonization for the year 1912-13 in New Ontario and Northern Timiskaming, especially the District of Nipissing and Algoma East and County of Timiskaming, P.Q., has been very successful not only as to the number of settlers but also in respect to amount of money invested. During the spring of 1912, delegations from the United States sent by intending settlers came to visit the different settlements and report to those who sent them. I went with them each time that I was able. They were generally satisfied with the country and reported very favourably.

I attend to a large correspondence. This year I have received 755 letters. I have written 806 and I have sent 1,200 parcels of pamphlets and maps.

I have brought about 1,250 souls to Northern Temiskaming, Ontario, who were placed on 238 lots. I have placed families on some 45 lots in Timiskaming, P.Q.; these families include about 325 souls.

Your obedient servant,

J. B. L. BOURASSA,

Colonization Agent.

1913-14

The reports of the five colonization agents appearing in the report of the Department for 1913-14 are somewhat indefinite as to the numbers of persons actually repatriated from the United States. The reports follow:—

REPORT OF REV. B. H. GIROUX

MONTREAL, P.Q., April 15, 1914.

W. D. SCOTT, Esq.,
Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa, Canada.

SIR,—During the fiscal year of 1913-14 I gave thirty-four conferences in the New England States as follows: Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maine and New Hampshire. I went with settlers from Montreal to Grouard, Alta., leaving May 13, 1913, with 122 persons on the first excursion; July 22, 1913, I left with forty-eight persons on the second excursion; and on March 3, 1914, I left with thirty-seven persons on the third excursion. Besides giving thirty-four lectures in the New England States, I held many private meetings for persons seeking information on Western Canada. I advertised in the French newspapers of Quebec in order to reach and instruct all my compatriots in the New England States who could not attend my lectures and who only read Canadian newspapers such as *La Patrie*, *La Presse*, and *Le Droit*, and I have on hand many letters secured from people through such mediums of advertising. I directed twenty-five people to St. Simon, St. Jude, and St. Hyacinthe, Que., from Woonsocket, R.I. The Franco-Americans are glad to hear some one talk to them of their own country and are happy to return after they understand the opportunities there are there for them. Besides those whom I accompanied to the West, I directed, through correspondence and personal interviews, over 200 settlers to Western Canada.

My work was not entirely limited to the Peace River district, but considering myself a repatriation agent for the whole of Canada, I never hesitated in giving proper information about all parts of the Dominion, thus helping my colleagues of other provinces in securing a large number of our compatriots to be repatriated in Quebec, in Ontario, and in fact in all parts of Canada, as stated above.

At my headquarters in Montreal, 172 St. Antoine street, I received and answered a large number of letters addressed to me.

I have prepared within the last few months a little pamphlet on the Peace River district for distribution in the United States, and I find that a great many people are interested in that district.

I also assisted at three fairs, Rochester, N.Y., Brooklyn, Mass., Danbury, Conn., during the year, helping out the agents at said fairs.

Your obedient servant,

Rev. B. H. GIROUX,

Colonization Agent.

REPORT OF REV. J. A. NORMANDEAU

172 St. ANTOINE STREET,
MONTREAL, April 1, 1914.

W. D. SCOTT, Esq.,
Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa, Canada.

SIR,—In reporting on my work for last fiscal year, I may say that my appointment dates only from the 1st of January, 1914, and hence I have been engaged by the department only for three months of the fiscal year in question.

While my headquarters are at Montreal, my territory is in the United States, and I have been operating in New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine, Massachusetts, and Michigan. My method of advertising is the same as that of other colonization agents doing the same work, and includes advertising in French newspapers, personal interviews, and, wherever possible, public lectures and conferences. I find that many of our French compatriots in the United States subscribe for, or are furnished with, newspapers from their former Canadian homes, and I have been advertising in some of the Canadian papers with the object of reaching such people. Many of the French Canadians in the New England States do not subscribe for or read the local papers published in the States.

I have not yet completed the organization of my first excursion of settlers to Western Canada or to Quebec, but I expect to secure quite a number of settlers in the month of April.

Your obedient servant,

Rev. J. A. NORMANDEAU.

REPORT OF J. E. ROBILLARD

LANORAIE, Quebec, March 31, 1914.

W. D. SCOTT, Esq.,
Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa, Canada.

SIR,—I have the honour to submit my annual report as colonization agent in the New England States District for the year 1913-14.

My time has been employed attending to my correspondence, I have distributed a very large quantity of literature in my district, and in other states, inquiries having been received from any places outside of the New England States.

I have had a great many inquiries about the Peace River, Abitibi, and Timiskaming districts. I have done my utmost, as in the past, to make Canada more and more known. It is quite impossible to give the number of settlers I have been instrumental in sending to Canada, as I do not issue certificates and when one of my inquirers decides to go, his certificate for railway rates is issued by the nearest residential agent whose name appears in the pamphlets distributed.

The demand for literature is increasing every day, and prospects are bright for the future.

For further details will you refer to my weekly reports which are on record in the department.

Your obedient servant,

J. E. ROBILLARD,
Colonization Agent.

REPORT OF REV. J. B. L. BOURASSA

MONTREAL, April 1, 1914.

To the Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa, Ont.

SIR,—I beg to submit the report of my work for the year ending March 31, 1914. During the summer months I have devoted my time to visiting my colonization districts, encouraging the newly arrived, and accompanying new settlers coming from the Eastern United States, where I had delivered lectures during the year. I delivered fifty-five of these lectures in the Eastern States, I also gave some twelve conferences in Quebec. In all cases, the attendance was larger than last year, and it seems all present were more interested than last year. I am inclined to pause a little, and remark that my conferences in the province of Quebec did a great deal of good, in the sense that I prevented some twenty-five to thirty families from going to the United States, who came to Timiskaming, visited the country and most of them took land and seem to be happy.

In accordance with my custom I invited questions, and after my lecture was over, I had to answer many special questions about the country. I must say that through these Eastern States that I have visited the majority of the French population are very anxious to come back and see our settlements in Canada. It seems to me that a great movement would be possible if the Government could advance the money to facilitate the return of these excellent settlers.

The colonization for the year in New Ontario, and Northern Timiskaming, especially the district of Nipissing and Algoma East, and county of Timiskaming, P.Q., has been very successful, not only as to the number of settlers but also in respect to amount of money invested. During the spring of 1913 delegations from the United States sent by intending settlers visited the different settlements and reported to those who sent them. I went with them each time that I was able. They were generally satisfied with the country and reported very favourably.

I attend to a large correspondence. This year I have received 855 letters, have written 939, and have sent 1,000 parcels of pamphlets and maps.

I have brought to this country 1,500 souls, placing them in Northern Timiskaming, Ontario. I have also placed some twenty families, including about 140 souls on lands in Timiskaming, P.Q. Those in Ontario took 245 allotments of land and are pleased with their lot.

The crop, of every kind, has a very good appearance and promises a fine harvest to the settlers of New Ontario and Northern Timiskaming, Que. On account of the labour conditions I expect a greater movement in 1914.

Your obedient servant,

Rev. J. B. L. BOURASSA,

Colonization Agent.

REPORT OF REV. M. F. RICHARD

ROGERSVILLE, N.B., April 15, 1914.

W. D. SCOTT, Esq.,
Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa, Ont.

SIR,—You ask me for an annual report of my administration as agent of Colonization and Immigration from April, 1913, to March, 1914. As my appointment dates July 7, 1913, I cannot go beyond that date. I entered on my duties with a desire to render service to my country. Colonization is of the utmost importance to Canada, and I have devoted my resources and energy to that work for the last forty years. Repatriation is also of vast consequence. Though advanced in age, I consider that, outside of my profession, I could not utilize the last years of my life to better advantage than to these national questions, colonization and repatriation. In your letters of appointment I note the following words, "Your work will be to encourage repatriation of French Canadians now living in the New England States, and to do this you will have probably to make some visits to that part of the United States and secure settlers by personal canvass."

In the months of August and September last I visited the following cities and towns of Maine and Massachusetts, viz., Boston, Waltham, Lowell, New Bedford, Fall River, Brockton, Salem, Worcester, Fitchburg, Lawrence, Portland, Westbrook, Brunswick, Lewiston, Rumford Falls, Livermore Falls, Skowhegan, Waterville, Augusta, Lynn, Madison, Gardner, Chelsea, Newton, Bangor and other places. In each place I delivered a lecture on Colonization and Immigration, to numerous and apparently appreciative audiences, composed of French Acadians of Canadian origin. I endeavoured to convince them that Canada is a desirable country to live in, and I advised them strongly to return to their native land. No flag under the sun gives better protection and more advantages than the British flag. All possible liberty is given to every denomination and nationality. It is a great mistake to abandon the agricultural profession to engage in other pursuits, less worthy, less promising and less remunerative. It is most desirable for all interested to return to one's native country and continue the work so well accomplished by our ancestors, and thus contribute, as true patriots, to the prosperity and extension of our Canada. Quite a number of our people expressed their willingness and desire to come back to Canada, but they had not the means to do so. The expense of bringing back their families is beyond them. The young generation accustomed to city life and to handle money is not disposed to change their condition. I must say that I do not consider it good policy to bring back to Canada indiscriminatingly poor and undesirable immigrants. I am informed that as the result of my visit to the United States about 150 to 200 families have returned to New Brunswick and located in Kent, Northumberland, Gloucester, Westmoreland, Restigouche and Madawaska counties.

About twenty families bought abandoned farms, the balance settled on new land. It is difficult to ascertain the exact number of persons returned, as they generally settle in their former localities. I am informed that quite a number of immigrants returned to Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia since my visit. I met a large number of French Canadians and French Acadians in the States from these provinces and also from the Magdalen Islands. Each family averages from four to five members, so that I would say about 1,000 Canadians of French origin returned to Canada (Maritime Provinces) since my appointment as immigration and colonization agent.

My policy is also to make special efforts to retain our people at home. What Canada needs is courageous and practical settlers and tillers of the soil.

It is useless to depend on those not accustomed to colonization to open up new land and establish new settlements; they are not accustomed to such hard labour and slow returns. In order to encourage our young men to settle on new farms and give assistance to immigrants, we have organized a society called "Société de Colonization et de Repatriement." The centre of operation is Moncton, N.B., and we establish branches in every parish as far as possible in French centres. The work is now under way and it promises, as far as I can judge, to be at least a partial success. We desire to give some assistance to native sons and daughters who are without doubt the most desirable settlers, hence the organization of this society. I am giving all the assistance possible to this new patriotic organization, believing that in doing so I am fulfilling a national duty and performing my mission as a colonization and immigration agent, under your jurisdiction, in a worthy manner.

Your obedient servant,

Rev. M. F. RICHARD,
Colonization Agent.

Attached hereto and marked "A" is a copy of the Interrogatory Form used by the Royal Mail Steam Navigation Company. This form is filled in by the agent of the vessel on the date of departure from the British Isles.

Attached hereto and marked "B" is a copy of the Declaration Form used from the continent of Europe. This particular sample has the questions printed in English and Polish. Forms for other countries are printed in the various languages as required and the Declaration Form is similar.

Attached hereto and marked "C" is a copy of the Canadian Government Return. Separate sheets are furnished for each class, the forms being identical for each class with the exception of colour. It will be observed that the information called for on the Return is identical with that called for on the Interrogatory Form referred to above under item B.

Attached hereto and marked "D" is a statement regarding the forms which must be delivered by the ship's officers to the Canadian Immigration Officer on board immediately on arrival at Canadian ports of vessels carrying passengers and particularly of every passenger on board the vessel must be furnished on these forms.

For the forms covering assisted passage applications see page 87 of the printed evidence.

Witness my hand and seal this 25th day of August 1900.

Passenger's Signature

Booking Agent's Signature

M. F. RICHARD

Filed by Witness, A. L. Joliffe, Commissioner of Immigration

Memorandum:

Forms used with respect to immigrants proceeding to Canada

In order that the information called for on steamship manifests may be available, the steamship companies use what are known as Interrogatory or Declaration Forms. These forms are filled out by the intending passengers and finally delivered to the steamship purser, from which the manifest is made up. These forms are printed by the various steamship companies and the Department is not in possession of sample forms from each company, but it is understood that the forms of the various companies are uniform.

" A "

Attached hereto and marked " A " is a copy of the Interrogatory Form used by the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company. This type of form is used for persons sailing from the British Isles.

" B "

Attached hereto and marked " B " is a copy of the Declaration Form used from the continent of Europe. This particular sample has the questions printed in English and Polish. Forms for other countries are printed in the various languages as required and the Declaration Form is similar.

" C "

Attached hereto and marked " C " is a copy of the Canadian Government Return. Separate sheets are furnished for each class, the forms being identical for each class with the exception of colour. It will be observed that the information called for on the Return is identical with that called for on the Interrogatory or Declaration Forms referred to above.

" D "

Attached hereto and marked " D " is steamship manifest or Index Book. Forms " C " and " D," which together form the manifest required by law, must be delivered by the ships' officers to the Canadian Immigration Officer in charge immediately on arrival at Canadian ports of vessels carrying passengers, and particulars of every passenger on board the vessel must be furnished on these forms.

For the forms covering assisted passage applications, see page 37 to 44 of the printed evidence.

EXHIBIT A

THE ROYAL MAIL STEAM PACKET COMPANY

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT IMMIGRATION SERVICE
INTERROGATORY FORM

A Copy of this Form must be completed for each passenger before the Steamship Ticket is issued. This Form must be handed to the Purser of the Steamer on which Passenger sails. Read carefully the directions on the reverse side of this Form.

- 1. S.S. Class Date of Sailing
- 2. Name
(Print in block letters family name first)
- 3. Relationship 4. Sex 5. Age
(See instructions on back of this form)
- 6. Are you single, married, widowed or divorced?
- 7. Country and place of birth
- 8. Nationality 9. Race of people
(See instructions on back)
- 10. If in Canada before state between what period
- 11. At what address
- 12. Have you ever been refused admission to or deported from Canada?
- 13. Do you intend to reside permanently in Canada?
- 14. Can you read? 15. What language?
(See instructions on back)
- 16. By whom was passage paid? 17. Religion
(State denomination)
- 18. What trade or occupation did you follow in your own country?
- 19. What trade or occupation do you intend to follow in Canada?
- 20. If destined to a relative, friend or employer, state which and give name and full address. If not joining any person in Canada, give the address in Canada to which you are going
- 21. Give name, relationship and address of your nearest relative in the country from which you came.
If a wife or child are to follow you later to Canada give names and ages
- 22. Have you or any of your family ever been mentally defective?
- 23. Have you or any of your family ever been physically defective?
- 24. Have you or any of your family ever been tubercular?
- 25. If in possession of a passport give number, place and date of issue
- 26. Money in possession belonging to passenger
- 27. Travelling inland on

Passenger's Signature

Booking Agents Signature
Place and Date

READ INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY

In stating relationship (question 3), give the relationship to the head of the family accompanying. A wife joining husband already in Canada should be shown as "wife," and the children as "son," "daughter."

If the passenger is not accompanied by any member of his family, the word "none" should appear as the answer to question 3.

In question 9 give the race as traced through the father. If, for example, the father is French and the mother Irish, the race will be French.

In answering question 15, if more than one language is spoken give first the mother tongue.

Persons born in Canada who have not lost their British nationality are not required to answer questions 10 to 27, except question 20.

1. Name

2. Relationship

3. Age

4. Sex

5. Date of birth

6. Country and place of birth

7. Nationality

8. Race of people

9. If in Canada before date between which period

10. If in Canada before date between which period

11. If in Canada before date between which period

12. Have you ever been a resident in Canada

13. Do you intend to reside permanently in Canada

14. Can you read

15. What language

16. By what name was passport held

17. Religion

18. What trade or occupation do you follow in your own country

19. What trade or occupation do you intend to follow in Canada

20. If married, give name of wife and residence and full address. If not married, give name of Canada to which you are going

21. Give names of persons of whom you are dependent in the country

22. Have you or any of your family ever been mentally defective

23. Have you or any of your family ever been physically defective

24. Have you or any of your family ever been tubercular

25. If in possession of a passport give number, place and date of issue

26. Money in possession belonging to passenger

27. Travelling inland on

Passenger's Signature

Booking Agent's Signature

Place and Date

EXHIBIT B

CANADIAN DECLARATION FORM

To be completed at time of booking

PERSONS BORN IN CANADA, WHO HAVE NOT LOST THEIR BRITISH NATIONALITY,

ANSWER QUESTIONS 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 & 20 ONLY.

Steamship Line..... Agent's Name..... Town..... Contract Ticket No.....Class on Steamer Steamer for which booked..... Date of Sailing..... From.....
--	---

Name in Full		Relationship (See below)	Age		Single Married, Widowed or Divorced	Place of Birth	
Family name Nazwisko Print in Block Letters	Given Names Imie		Male Mezki	Female Zenski		Country	Town
2		3	4	5	6	7	
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							

Nationality Country of which a Citizen or Subject Narodowosc	Race or People see over Rasa lub narod	If passenger has previously resided in Canada, state Jesli pasazer poprzednio mieszkal w Kanadzie podac		Have you ever been refused admission to or deported from Canada? Czy byl P. kiedy zawrocony z Kanady	Do you intend to reside perman- ently in Canada? Czy zamierza P. osied- lic sie w Kanadzie?	Can you read Czy umie P. czytac	What Language W jakim jezyku	By whom was pass- age paid? Kto zaptacit szyfskarte?
		between what periods w jakim czasie	at what address pod jakim adresem					
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								

EXHIBIT B

Religion. Give denomination See below Religja	What trade or occupa- tion did you follow in your own Country Czem P. sie zajmowat w swoim kraju	What trade or occupa- tion do you intend to follow in Canada Czem P. zamierza sie zajac w Kanadzie	If destined to relative, friend or employer state which and give full name and address If not joining any person, give address in Canada to which you are going. Full particulars required. Jesli P. jedzie do krewnego, znajomego, lub pracodawcy wymienie jego nazwisko i adres.	Give name, relationship and address of your nearest relative in the country from which you came. Podac nazwisko, pokrewienstwo adres najblizszego krewnego w kraju z ktorego P. pochodzi.
17	18	19	20	21
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

	If wife or children are to follow you later to Canada, give names and ages Jesli zona lub dzieci P. maja pozniej wyjechać do Kanady podać ich imiona i wiek	Have you or your family ever been Czy był P. lub rodzina P kiedyś			Passport Particulars Jesli P. posiada paszport, wymienić			Money in possession belonging to passenger Ile pasazer posiada pieniędzy
		Mentally defective? Umystowo chorym	Physically defective? Fizycznie chorym	Tuber- cular? Tuberku- licznym?	Number liczba	Place of issue miejsce wystawienia	Date of issue Data wystawienia	
		21	22	23	24	25	26	
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								

DECLARATION OF PASSENGER

I hereby certify that I made true answers to the above questions, which were asked in a language understood by me, and which answers have been recorded above I understand that I may, on arrival, be called upon to swear to the truth of above answers and that a false oath is punishable by fine or imprisonment.

Signature of Passenger

OSWIADCZENIE PASAZERA

Stwierdzam nimejszym, że na powyższe pytania które mnie zadano w języku zrozumiałym dla mnie dałem prawdziwe odpowiedzi, które zapisane zostały jak wyżej. Rozumiem, że po przyjeździe mogę być wezwany do złożenia przysięgi na prawdziwość powyższych odpowiedzi i że fałszywa przysięga jest karana grzywną lub więzieniem.

Podpis pasazera

To be filled in by CANADIAN IMMIGRATION OFFICER

Port..... Date.....

Granted
 Visa

Refused

Remarks

Signature

Question 3.—In stating relationship (question 3) state relationship to head of family accompanying or already in Canada.

If not accompanied nor joining relative state "none."

Question 17.—In stating religion, actual denomination must be given, i. e., Church of England, Roman Catholic, Wesleyan, etc., "Protestant" is not sufficient.

The Canadian Government Regulations require all Third Class passengers who cannot show signs of vaccination either to be vaccinated before landing or to be detained in quarantine.

If a passenger is unfit to travel, or has any physical or mental complaint or defect, he (or she) may be rejected at the ship's side.

LIST OF RACES OR PEOPLES

RACE TO BE DETERMINED BY RACE OF FATHER

African (other than negro)	English	Negro
Albanian	Finnish	Norwegian
Arabian	French	Persian
Armenian	Galician (Polish)	Polish (N. E. S.)
Austrian (N. E. S.)	German (N. E. S.)	Portuguese
Bavarian	Greek	Roumanian (N. E. S.)
Belgian	Hebrew (Jewish)	Russian
Bohemian	Hungarian (Magyar)	Ruthenian (Russniak)
Bukowinian (Roumanian)	Icelandic	Scotch
Bulgarian	Irish	Serbian
Chinese	Italian	Slovenian
Croatian	Japanese	Spanish
Cuban	Korean	Swedish
Czech	Latvian	Swiss
Dalmatian	Lithuanian	Syrian
Danish	Magyar (Hungarian)	Turkish
Dutch	Mexican	Ukrainian (N. E. S.)
East Indian	Montenegrin	Welsh
Egyptian	Moravian	West Indian

EXHIBIT C

Sheet No.....
Third Class

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RETURN

EXHIBIT "C"

S.S.....SAILING FROM.....19.....

Line	Family Name, Given Name	Relationship	Age		Single, Married, Widowed or Divorced	Country and Place of Birth	Nati- onality (Country of which a Citizen or Subject)	Race or People	If in Canada Before		Ever Refused Entry to or Deported from Canada?	Do you intend to reside perman- ently in Canada?	Can you Read?	What Language	By whom was Passagepaid
			M.	F.					Between what Period	At what Address					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1															
2															

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION SERVICE

Sheet No.
Third Class

ARRIVING AT.....19.....

Line	Occupation		Destination	Give name, relationship and address of your nearest relative in the country from which you came. If a wife or children are to follow you later to Canada, gives names and ages	Have you or any of your family ever been			Passport	Money in possession belonging to passenger	Travelling inland on	Action taken and Civil Examiner
	What trade or occupation did you follow in your own country?	What trade or occupation do you intend to follow in Canada?	If destined to relative, friend or employer state which and give name and full address. If not joining any person in Canada, give the address in Canada to which you are going		Mentally defective	Physically defective	Tubercular				
17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
1											
2											

INSTRUCTIONS TO PURSERS

In completing manifests pursers will, as far as possible, confine themselves to the countries of birth, races and languages of people mentioned hereunder. Manifest forms are printed for First Class, Cabin Class, and Third Class. The terms "First Class" and "Cabin Class" are used to distinguish between two classes of Cabin passengers. On a two-cabin ship First, Cabin and Third Class manifests will be used. On a one Cabin ship, Cabin and Third Class manifests will be used. The manifests must be arranged so as to have First Class passengers come first, Cabin Class second, and Third Class last. In the First Class and Cabin Class sections of the manifests, all passengers must be arranged in the following order:—

1. Returning Canadians.

- (a) Persons born in Canada,
- (b) Persons (whether British or Aliens) who have previously resided in Canada and have been absent for a temporary purpose only.

2. Tourists.

3. Immigrants (persons intending to reside permanently in Canada and not included in No. 1.)

In the Third Class section of the manifests all passengers must be arranged in the following order:—

1. Returning Canadians (see definition above),

2. All others divided into two groups:—

- (a) British subjects,
- (b) Aliens.

All passenger lists must be arranged in alphabetical order and in their respective groups as defined above, each group to be arranged under its proper heading, such as "Returning Canadians"; "Tourists"; "Immigrants." (Use one line for group heading.) The page and line of the sheet manifest must be entered in the margin of the manifest known as the Index Book. In the case of births or deaths at sea, the Purser should make a notation in red ink opposite the name, giving date of birth or death as the case may be, together with any other information called for in Section 49, sub-sections 2 and 3 of the Immigration Act. All forms should be typewritten.

Persons shown in Column 7 as having been born in Canada and who have not lost their British nationality are not required to give the information asked for in columns 10 to 27 column 20. Columns 27 and 28 of the sheet manifest will be filled in by the Immigration examiner at port of landing.

Each passenger must be given a landing card showing the page and line of the manifest on which his name is found.

Race of people is to be traced through the father. If, for example, the father is French and the mother Irish, the race of the child will be French.

The term "Relationship" in column 3, means the relationship to the Head of the family accompanying. A wife joining husband already in Canada would be shown as "wife" and the children as "son," "daughter."

✓ In filling in column 15, where more than one language is spoken, give first the mother tongue.

N.E.S. means not elsewhere specified.

COUNTRIES OF BIRTH

Africa (British, other than S.A. and Egypt)	Czecho-Slovakia	Jugo-Slavia (Serbia-Dalmatia)	Portugal
Africa, N.E.S.	Denmark	Korea	Roumania
Argentina	Dutch Guiana	Latvia	Russia
Albania	Egypt	Lithuania	Scotland
Arabia	Ecuador	Malta	South Africa (Union of)
Armenia	England	Mesopotamia	Spain
Asia, N.E.S.	Esthonia	Mexico	St. Pierre and Miquelon
Australia	Finland	Newfoundland	Straits Settlements
Austria	France	New Zealand	Sweden
Belgium	French Guiana	Norway	Switzerland
British Guiana	Germany	Pacific Islands	Syria
British West Indies	Greece	Palestine	Turkey in Asia
Bulgaria	Holland	Panama	Uruguay
Brazil	Hungary	Paraguay	United States of America
Bolivia	Iceland	Persia	Venezuela
Central America	India	Peru	Wales
China	Ireland	Philippines	
Chili	Italy	Poland	
Cuba	Japan		

RACES OF PEOPLES

Albanian	Egyptian	Maltese	Slavenian
Arabian	English	Mexican	Spanish
Armenian	Finnish	Montenegrin	Swedish
Asian, N.E.S.	French	Moravian	Swiss
Austrian, N.E.S.	German, N.E.S.	Negro	Syrian
Belgian	Greek	Norwegian	Turkish
Bulgarian	Hebrew (Jewish)	Persian	Ukrainian (including Ruthenina and Russniak)
Bohemian	Hungarian (Magyar)	Philippino	U.S.A. (European extraction) race not otherwise determined.
Chinese	Icelandic	Polish, N.E.S.	Welsh
Croatian	Irish	Portuguese	West Indian
Cuban	Italian	Roumanian, N.E.S.	
Czech	Japanese	Russian	
Danish	Korean	Scotch	
Dutch	Latvian	Serbian	
East Indian	Lithuanian	(also Dalmatian)	

LANGUAGES

Albanian	Finnish	Korean	Scotch (Gaelic)
Armenian (Aramaic)	Flemish	Lettish	Slovenian
Bulgarian	French	Lithuanian	Spanish
Chinese	German	Manx	Swedish
Croat (Serbian)	Greek	Norwegian	Syrian (Arabic)
Czech (Bohemian)	Hebrew	Polish	Turkish
Danish	Hungarian (Magyar)	Portuguese	Walloon
Dutch	Icelandic	Roumanian	Welsh
East Indian	Irish (Gaelic)	Ruthenian (Russniak and Ukaranian)	Yiddish
English	Italian	Russian	
Esthonian	Japanese		

EXHIBIT D

S.S. MANIFEST

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION SERVICE

VOYAGE No.....

S.S..... Line.....
 Sailed from..... on..... 19.....
 Arrived at..... on..... 19..... at..... o'clock..... m.

Details	First Class			Cabin Class			Third Class			Totals		Grand Total
	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	Total	Canada	U.S.	
Adults.....												
Children.....												
Infants.....												
Totals.....												

Total Passenger Capacity of Vessel..... { First Class.....Souls
 { Cabin Class.....Souls
 { Third Class.....Souls

INSTRUCTIONS TO PURSERS

In completing manifests pursers will as far as possible confine themselves to the countries of birth and races of people mentioned hereunder. Manifest forms are printed for First Class, Cabin Class and Third Class. The terms "First Class" and "Cabin Class" are used to distinguish between two classes of Cabin passengers. On a two class ship First, Cabin and Third Class manifests will be used. On a one Cabin ship Cabin and Third Class manifests will be used. The manifests must be arranged so as to have First Class Passengers come first, Cabin Class second and Third Class last. In the *First Class* and *Cabin Class* sections of the manifests, all passengers must be arranged in the following order:

1. Returning Canadians (persons having previous residence in Canada).
2. Tourists.
3. Immigrants (persons intending to reside permanently in Canada).

In the *Third Class* section of the manifests all passengers must be arranged in the following order:

1. Returning Canadians.
2. All others.

All passenger lists must be arranged in alphabetical order. The page and line of the sheet manifest must be entered in the margin of the manifest known as the Index Book. In the case of births or deaths at sea the purser should make a notation in red ink opposite the name, giving date of birth or death, as the case may be, together with any other information called for in Section 49, sub-sections 2 and 3 of the Immigration Act. All forms should be typewritten.

Persons shown in Column 7 as having been born in Canada and who have not lost their British nationality are not required to give the information asked for in columns 10 to 28 except column 20. Column 28 of the sheet manifest will be filled in by the Immigration examiner at port of landing.

Each passenger must be given a landing card showing the page and line of the manifest on which his name is found.

This space to be filled in by Immigration Agent at Port of Landing

S.S.Line
 Sailed fromLine19
 Arrived aton19ato'clockm.
 Landed ato'clockm. First ClassCabin Class.....
 Third ClassTotal
 Bill of HealthNo. held at Quarantine.....

FIRST and CABIN CLASS INSPECTION

Medical Examinersbegan at.....completed at.....
 No. detained by Medical Examiners for Canada.....for U.S.A.Total.....
 Civil Examinersbegan at.....completed at.....
 No. detained by Civil Examiners for Canada.....for U.S.A.Total.....

THIRD CLASS INSPECTION

Medical Examinersbegan at.....completed at.....
 No. detained by Medical Examiners for Canada.....for U.S.A.Total
 Civil Examiners.....began at.....completed at.....
 No. detained by Civil Examiners for Canada.....for U.S.A.Total
 C.P.R. passengers left bytrain at
 C.N.R. passengers left bytrain at

Port Agent.

MANIFEST

VESSEL'S NAME	TONNAGE	Total number of Superficial Feet in the several Compartments set apart for passengers other than Cabin passengers	WHERE BOUND

SUMMARY

	Number of Souls	Number of adults to which they are equal under the Immigration Act
Adults.....		
Children under 14 years of age.....		
Total.....		

CERTIFICATE OF MASTER OF VESSEL

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above is a complete list of all passengers and stowaways on board the.....at the time of her departure from.....and that I have caused the surgeon of the vessel to make the examination required in section 49, ss. 1 of the Immigration Act and from the report of the said surgeon and from my own investigation I believe that the information in the steamship manifests is correct and true in every respect.

Declared before.....

this.....day of.....192....

(Signature of Master)

(Immigration Officer)

CERTIFICATE OF SHIP'S SURGEON

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have, during the present passage, made the inspection called for in Section 49, ss. 1 of the Immigration Act, and that to the best of my knowledge and belief the information given in the manifests is true and correct in all particulars relating to the mental and physical condition of said passengers with the exception of.....persons whose names are enumerated on the Ship Surgeon's list which I have prepared.

Declared before.....

this.....day of.....192....

(Signature of Ship's Surgeon)

(Immigration Officer)

Memorandum:

Australian and New Zealand Immigration Forms

Copies of application and other forms used by the Governments of Australia and New Zealand are not on file in the Department.

PRODUCTION

Filed by Witness Owen Culshaw

May 10, 1928.

A. A. FRASER, Esq.,
 Clerk of the Committee,
 Agriculture and Colonization,
 Ottawa, Ont.

DEAR SIR,—In checking over my evidence given this morning in regard to the Medical examination, and in particular to the illustration relative to the case of one, Flora MacDonald, I regret to say that I find I made a mistake in giving the weight of the girl at 150 lbs. While I was speaking I had the weight in my mind according to English standards, i.e. 15 Stone, but unfortunately I mentally transposed this as 10 lb. to the Stone, hence the error for which I offer my apologies to the Committee.

I shall be glad, therefore, if this explanation can be made in the official records.

Yours faithfully,

M. OWEN CULSHAW,
Staff Captain.

NOTE.—15 stone, 14 lbs. to the stone, equals 210 lbs.

Memorandum filed by the Department of Immigration and Colonization

On page 516 (No. 17) of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, dated Thursday, May 10th, 1928, Mr. Culshaw of the Salvation Army stated that a household worker named Flora L. McDonald of Glasgow, Scotland, has been refused the reduced rate and that no other reason was given than that this migrant weighed 150 pounds. Mr. Culshaw stated in part as follows:—

By Hon. Mr. Forke:

Q. She was refused only because she weighed 150 pounds?—A. Yes.

Q. For nothing more than that?—A. Nothing more than that. If you will look at our London files you will find a letter in regard to this girl saying that "she is of stupendous weight and we cannot recommend her for assisted passage." We have since appealed the case and the Director has endorsed the card that she could come forward as a fully paid passenger, but she cannot be given the reduced rate, and there is no other reason given to us than that she weighs 150 pounds.

Q. The Departmental records will have to be examined?—A. I will give you the name of the girl. Her name is Flora L. McDonald; she comes from Glasgow.

We cabled London to submit an immediate report regarding this case and the following reply has just been received from the Director of Emigration in London:—

GOVT LONDON

IMMIGRATION

Ottawa

Culshaws statement respecting Flora McDowall gross misrepresentation facts stop McDowall certified three C marked obesity stunted height weight two hundred and ten pounds avoirdupois her breadth almost equal her height not a domestic and never was now unemployed and because of obesity decidedly unemployable case papers mailed preserve and return

TOROSUS

You will notice by the above cable that Flora McDowall was certified under paragraph (c) of Section 3 of the Immigration Act, which section reads in part as follows:—

3. No immigrant, passenger or other person unless he is a Canadian citizen, or has Canadian domicile, shall be permitted to enter or land in Canada, or in case of having landed in or entered Canada shall be permitted to remain therein, who belongs to any of the following classes, hereinafter called "prohibited classes":—

(a) —

(b) —

(c) Immigrants who are dumb, blind, or otherwise physically defective, unless in the opinion of a Board of Inquiry or officer acting as such they have sufficient money, or have such profession, occupation, trade, employment or other legitimate mode of earning a living that they are not liable to become a public charge or unless they belong to a family accompanying them or already in Canada and which gives security satisfactory to the Minister against such immigrants becoming a public charge.

Filed by Witness, Miss Gertrude Childs

Cindler—

Father, born in 1862, died 1920.

Mother, aged 50,

No. 3 aged 29, son.

All born in Eastern Galicia, Poland,
formerly Austria.

No. 4 aged 23, daughter.

No. 5 aged 21, son.

No. 6 aged 17, son.

No. 7 aged 10, son, born in Winnipeg.

Father was born in Austria of Jewish parents. Had some elementary education in Jewish and at an early age became apprenticed to a *glazier* in native district. Came to Canada in October, 1913, to wife's brother (who is well off), having brought eldest boy with him. Worked only a very short period prior to outbreak of War.

Appearance.—Short, heavy set, coarse features on square face, brimmed with thick, dark brown beard, small eyes, in all giving him a grizzly look. Prominent curvature of the spine and shabby unclean appearance (on week days only) on Sabbath he was always well-dressed and spotless.

Health.—He suffered from Chronic Bronchitis and Asthma, weak heart, deformed chest. (Medical reports Dr. McDonald 1915 and Dr. Hamilton 1916).

Letter from Winnipeg General Hospital February 10th, 1922, also shows he suffered from sclerosis and in April, 1920, had a cancerous growth removed from under right arm pit. In June, 1920 he was again at the Hospital, diagnosis Carcinoma of right breast, extending to the axilla (armpit). Operated on and died on 13th Aug. 1920. Primary cause Carcinoma of breast; secondary cause Right-sided Pneumonia.

Mentality.—On 16th October, 1918, Dr. Hinks of the National Commission for dealing with Insane, together with his Secretary, Miss Keyes, called at the house and stated afterwards that this man was mentally deficient.

As far as the woman is concerned, Dr. Hinks stated she was mentally deficient. Dr. Mathers, on October 1st, 1921, examined her and found her to be of mental age of approximately 12 years, definitely subnormal, but could not be classed as "feeble-minded."

Mother.—Born of Jewish parents, same as her husband. Was domestic prior to marriage. Illiterate, though she speaks three or four languages fluently.

Appearance.—Tall, heavy build, rather masculine, bad teeth, squinted eyes, slight lisp in speech, great beggar, *poor housekeeper*, sloppy, filthy and untidy. Tender mother, was a very faithful wife to her late husband and devoted to her children.

Health.—Afflicted with Sinovitis (Muscular pain).

Arrival in Canada.—M. brought her out here in 1914 and she came on August 7th, 1914 with the children enumerated No. 4, 5 and 6. (See below).

No. 3, son, left home very early, probably in 1915. Not much is known of him. He was here to his father's funeral but his mother would not let us see him. It is doubtful if he is very bright.

No. 4, girl, aged 23. She is short and has one measure from her shoulders to the waist line. She is squinted, has deformed teeth, is very childish, has an extremely unpleasant appearance.

Med. Diagnosis—None. Attended school (never got beyond Consider her rather (Grade one, A.L.) mentally deficient, Dr. A. A. Hamilton, Dated Winnipeg General Hospital, 20th January, 1916.

On 16th October, 1918, Dr. Hinks said: "Self-evident mental deficiency. (She is still at home and being followed by mother everywhere she goes.)"

Dr. Mathers diagnosis 1-10-21, definitely mental age 8.6/00, given age 16, real age 18. Intelligence co-efficient of .55, should be reduced since the mother did not give her correct age.

On July 24th, 1922, her mental age is shown as 7 years and co-efficient of .41. Requires Institutional care.

Son, aged 20.—School Rept. May, 1923, shows he was still at school in Grade 6, this was his 9th year at school. Health good, very slow. Up to grade in spelling only. Arithmetic only to Grade 3 or 4, lazy and inattentive, no initiative, is not in any sense troublesome, however.

Occupation.—None, at times selling newspapers.

Mentality.—According to Dr. Hinks: Deficient. Dr. Mathers, with a physical age of 14 years, gives a mental age of 10/7/12, co-efficient .78. His real age however 18 and not 14. His co-efficiency is, therefore, very materially lower.

Dr. Mathers says he is a border-line case that may ultimately have to be considered as definitely feeble-minded.

Son, 16.—Dr. Hinks thought this boy was unusually bright when compared with the rest of the family. In 1921 his examination by Prov. Psychiatrist showed him somewhat deficient, but on July 24, 1923, Dr. Mathers reports a co-efficient of .98, with chronological age of 13 10/12. (He is really one year older than that). Shows very good results at school. Normal.

Son No. —High-grade Moron, mental age 5, physical age 7, co-efficient .60.

Relief.—Family first applied for assistance in December, 1914, and remained a public charge till date. Up to October 31, 1923, the family was assisted by the United Hebrew Relief, Associated Charities, S.W. Ass'n. and S.W.C. respectively. After that date and until now, only by the M.A. Commission and besides were known to be habitual beggars or rather "snorers" among the better off Jewish quarters.

Deportation.—Had it not been for the World War, same would have taken place. Family has acquired legal domicile and could not be deported now.

Naturalization.—Since the man's death the woman became naturalized and has been under allowance from Child Welfare. S.W.C. Relief issued to family:

1915..	\$ 34 27
1916..	210 65
1917..	273 07
1918..	498 92
1919..	608 85
1920..	821 04
1921..	735 73

1922..	677 42
1923..	530 25
1926..	200 58

Total..	\$4,590 78
Plus Child Welfare 1924-1925..	2,457 00

Plus Hospital expenses.

Mr. Stenson born in England, orphaned, put to work, came to U.S.A., then to Canada, in 1906. Married in Winnipeg in 1909. Worked in city steadily until 1922. Assistance given 1914-1922 by church and neighbours because of insufficient income.

Mrs. Stenson was born in England in 1888, came to Canada in 1905, worked in woollen mills in England from age of 12 until came to Canada. Worked for White Star Manufacturing Co., and Smart Bag Co., until marriage in 1909.

See report from Psychopathic Hospital, Jan., 1923: "We have now examined nine members of the Stenson family, with the following result:

George Stenson, Father, 47 years of age, English, arrived in Canada 1904. Did well at school, and up to a few years ago apparently was steadily employed. He is somewhat hyochrondriacal and is lacking in initiative. He is *neither mentally deficient or psychotic*.

Eva Stenson, mother, 37 years of age, arrived in Canada 1904. Apparently a normal infancy. At school reached Standard 3, at 13 years. Mental age 9 $\frac{7}{12}$ years, intelligence co-efficient .62, a *high grade moron*.

Stanley Stenson, 15 years of age, born in Canada. Mental age 9; intelligence co-efficient .68. A *high-grade moron*.

Evelyn Stenson, 13 $\frac{6}{12}$ years of age; mental age 7 years; intelligence co-efficient .45. A *high-grade moron*.

Harold Stenson, 11 years of age; mental age 6 $\frac{9}{12}$ years; intelligence co-efficient .40. A *high-grade imbecile*.

Maurice Stenson, 8 $\frac{6}{12}$ years, mental age 6 $\frac{5}{12}$. Intelligence co-efficient .66. A *high-grade moron*.

Cyril Stenson, 6 years, grade 4 years by the Knox Scale, Intelligence co-efficient .63. A *low-grade moron*.

Dorothy Stenson, 4 years, mental age 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ years. Knox Scale, *Probably another moron*.

Irene Stenson, 2 years, tested between one and two years by the Binet Test. *Intelligence normal* so far as could be judged at the present time. Signed A. T. Mathers.

Alice Stenson, 9 $\frac{8}{12}$ years, mental age 8 $\frac{1}{12}$ years. Intelligence co-efficient .87. *Sub-normal intelligence*.

Gordon, aged 12, is still to be examined.

Relief 1922—\$73.99

Relief 1923—161.64 plus Unemployment Relief Dec.

Relief 1924— 64.00 plus Unemployment Relief Dec.

Relief 1925— 14.69 Total \$314.32

Hospital care:

<i>Gordon.</i>	From Oct. 17-22 to June 24-23; 250 days at \$1.75 per day	\$ 437 50
<i>Margaret.</i>	From Oct. 30-22 to Dec. 15-22; 46 days at \$1.75 per day	80 50
<i>Cyril.</i>	From Jan. 17-23 to Jan. 26-23; 9 days at \$1.75 per day	15 75
<i>Alice.</i>	From May 22-23 to June 8-23; 17 days at \$1.75 per day	29 75
<i>Gordon.</i>	From July 23-23 to Feb. 2-24; 213 days at \$1.75 per day	372 75
<i>Morris.</i>	From Sept. 25-23 to Oct. 11-23; 16 days at \$1.75 per day	28 00
<i>Mrs. S.</i>	To Board and Nursing at General Hospital from Dec. 16-23 to Jan. 19-24; 34 days at \$1.75 per day	59 50

To Board and Nursing at Children's Hospital—

<i>Dorothy.</i>	From Feb. 2-24 to Mar. 25-24; 52 days at \$1.75 per day	91 00
<i>Morris.</i>	From July 29-24 to Aug. 7-24; 9 days at \$1.75 per day	15 75
<i>Wilfred.</i>	From Jan. 14-25 to Feb. 4-25; 21 days at \$1.75 per day	36 75
		<hr/>
		\$1,167 25

1927

1. Assisted	1,683
2. British	928
3. Foreign	755
4. Assisted Passage	Nil
5. 1st time	1,117
6. Repeats	566

*Filed and Printed by order of Committee on application of Mr. Boulanger, M.P.
(Translation from French)*

To the Honourable the Minister of Justice,
Honourable Members of the Cabinet.

It is the wish of more than a quarter of a million electors that the members of this delegation are here to acquaint you with.

You are not without knowing, Sir, that there exists in Canada quite a marked movement of exodus to the American and Canadian cities. Statistics lately gathered on this subject show this clearly.

It is undeniable that among the causes of this exodus, is the impossibility for a great number of heads of families to settle their sons. Therefore these native sons of Canada leave for foreign lands or large cities under disadvantages, both to themselves and the country as a whole.

On the other hand, within the last few years, great efforts have been made to populate Canada through immigration. With that aim in view the Government has greatly increased the advantages in favour of immigrants, especially British immigrants. Reduced transportation rates, assistance in the way of loans and in every possible manner, nothing has been spared to make our country as hospitable as possible to the new comers, brought to our shores so as to develop the natural wealth of our Country.

While these immigrants enjoyed these numerous advantages, the Canadian settler was left to his own resources. Too high transportation rates, lack of any assistance, kept him away from this source of wealth, in which he would like to share. It is therefore not astonishing that he has too often taken the road to the United States or has sought to better himself in towns.

As long as the public was not apprised of the existing situation, the people submitted without too much complaining of conditions they thought normal, to-day, however, things have changed.

In the course of the three weeks these signatures that we are submitting to you were gathered, we received a great number of letters expressing real indignation. This indignation over the inferior treatment meted out to the Canadian settler, did not come from individuals here and there, but from people high up and with influence speaking on behalf of large groups. We deem it our duty, Sir, we missionaries of colonization and representatives of national societies, to acquaint you of the present situation.

If we include the number of parishes which have answered our appeal by sending a certain number of signatures gathered, notwithstanding the poor condition of roads which hampered a great number of them, if on the other hand we take into account that women electors, with a few exceptions, were not asked to sign this petition, if we further add the large number of parishes which requested a further delay so as to get everybody to sign, we are in a position to state that the 125,000 signatures which are making the present request that has been submitted for your consideration, represent the wish of more than a quarter of a million electors. Many more thousands of signatures that have been delayed will reach us, we shall deem it a duty to forward to you, Sir, the expression of their wish.

In this petition, signed by representatives of all classes, from the province of Quebec and centres where the French language is spoken in the province of Ontario, the West and the Maritime provinces, in this petition where are mingled the names of leaders, pastors, names of the most honourable and venerable citizens, together with those of workmen and farmers, what is requested?

The wording of the petition is very explicit. (The text of the petition follows):

Numerous articles which have appeared in the English newspapers, as well as the clear statements of many notable people, representatives of the English element, lead us to believe that the request we have placed before you meets with the assent of those citizens no less desirous than we are of seeing Canada expand and of keeping its best citizens in this country.

This petition, Sir, is very opportune to second the Boulanger motion which requests on the whole the same things as we are ourselves asking.

We believe, Sir, that it would be an excellent opportunity to prove to the electors who up to the present have placed their trust and given you their support, that your desire and that of the Government are to meet the just claims contained in this petition.

An objection which has already been disproved by the honourable member for Bellechasse, is that such favourable treatment would have for effect of emptying the eastern provinces to the benefit of the west.

It is easy to see through the absurdity of such a fear. Only those who are forced to, will leave the eastern provinces.

No one deserts his parish or his province just for the sake of going away.

In fact, first the Western provinces will always be far off lands and consequently less attractive.

Secondly, the trip, no matter how alluring may be the rates of transportation, will always require a considerable outlay.

Thirdly, usually lands are not given away since \$6,000 is needed to purchase a half section of good land.

Fourthly, the Western lands will never have the very great attraction which Canadian cities have, nor the enchanting inducement of the Quebec countryside.

Fifthly, furthermore, the future western settler will have to sell his farm in the east before he is able to leave for the west, because he will be in need of money.

It is quite evident, when we consider that every year, when the harvesters' excursions take place, those taking part can travel to the Prairie provinces for about \$20. Hundreds of Canadians take the trip with the idea of making their home there and in no way do the eastern provinces feel the decrease nor are they the poorer.

As it is necessity and not pleasure which urges our fellow citizens to seek their share of the Canadian West's wealth, there is no reason to believe that a movement will take place from east to west except the displacement of those which necessity forces to leave. Under such circumstances, experience proves that if the present prohibitive rates continue, the exodus to the United States will also continue, as it has been the case for over sixty years.

We should feel very happy, Sir, to learn from your lips, and by an official act of the Government, that already the people's wish has not only been heard, but also granted.

We feel confident that your spirit of fairplay and justice, and that also of the Government, will accede to claims which are very in earnest and intend to continue until entire justice is done.

The "Bureau des Missionnaires—Colonisations". National Societies, by
Signers:

Gen. Mgrs. M. Bilodeau, ptre.

Joseph Hallé, Bishop of Petree, Superior of the Miss. Colonisations of Canada.

J. A. Ouellet, Ptre. representing the Archbishop of Montreal.

A. S. Deschene, Ptre. Missionnaire Colonisations, representing Manager Plante.

- A. Erny Aoid, Ptre. Miss. Col., representing Mgr. Mathiew dioc. of Regina.
 L. M. Cornellier, La Chambre de Commerce de Montreal.
 A. Lepage, Ptre., Alberta central.
 J. P. Malo, Conseil Central des Simdicats Catholiques de Montreal.
 Henry L. Auger, Societé Saint Jean Baptiste de Montreal et la Societé Nationale de colonisation.
 Lionel Lanoise, societé St. Jean Baptiste, Section N. D. au Très St. Sacrement. Representing also le Comité de la Fédération des Sociétés Catholiques de Montréal.
 Aldéric Lalonde, président of L. U. C. C.
 Thomas Poulin, L'Action Sociale Catholique of Quebec, Saint Jean Baptiste de Quebec.
 L'Abbé J. E. Secours, ptre., representing l'Archevêché of Ottawa.
 Herman Bruneau, Ottawa, Ont.
 P. M. Prevost, A. C. J. C.
 Thomas Moncion, A. C. v de Hull.
 L. J. Chaquon, St. John Baptiste Soc., Ottawa.
 J. A. Lapointe, Organizer Societé des Artisans C.-F.
 Adélarde Chartrand, Director general, Artisans, C.-F.
 Rodolphe Lapointe, Representing l'A. C. U.
 C. A. Ménard, Order of Jacques Cartier.
 J. P. I. Gagnon, Très, Gén. l'A. C. V., Montréal.
 J. Victor Cholette, Prés. Chambre de Commerce, Hull.
 J. Victor Cholette, Directeur des Oeuvres Sociales, Ottawa.
 A. Bélanger, President St. John the Baptist Society.

To the Honourable Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice. To all his honourable colleagues in the Federal Cabinet. To all the honourable members representing in the House of Commons ridings where electors speaking the French language are to be found.

The Central Committee at a regular meeting held on March 23, 1928, on a motion introduced by Mr. Henri Leroux, Manufacturer, seconded by Mr. Joseph Boileau, Manufacturer, unanimously adopt the following order of the day:

1. Whereas the Dominion Government has initiated an immigration campaign and grants special advantage to immigrants both from the United States, and from Europe, without granting equal advantages to Canadians who wish to establish themselves in districts of settlements throughout Canada.

2. And Whereas it behooves us to favour first the citizens of this country, and that Canadian citizens find it unfair that settling advantages be granted exclusively to foreigners;

3. And Whereas the present regime has the effect of forcing inevitably the Canadians to emigrate to the United States, who might establish themselves on lands that have been set aside for settlement;

4. And Whereas the surplus of our old Canadian parishes is the best settling element and already attached to the country by its traditions, and that we must not weaken before any sacrifice to keep it in this country;

We, the undersigned, members of the Central Committee of the Catholic Association of French Canadian youth, request the honourable Ministers and members who represent our race, that the following terms, be granted to the Canadian settlers:

1. That the very large amounts expended on foreign immigration be applied in such a way as to give preference first to the settlement of sons of large families residing in Canada or wishing to return from the United States;

2. That a special rate, limited to one cent per mile, to any point of settlement in Canada, as follows: in the province of Quebec, New Brunswick, Ontario

and the Canadian West, be granted to genuine settlers; that up to the age of seventeen inclusive children of said settlers be transported free of charge to said districts of settlement; that the same rates be granted, for a return ticket, to the heads of families wishing to visit the said districts with the object of settling there.

3. That an active campaign be carried on in the old parishes with the object of making known the real advantages offered by the Government to Canadian settlers.

The petitioners feel confident that through the good will of their members, the Government will grant their legitimate claims.

For the "Comité Central de l'A. C. J. C."

The Chief of the general secretary's office.

ALPHONSE de la ROCHELLE.

P. M. PREVOST.

To all members representing the French Canadian people:

We, the undersigned, request that the following terms be granted to the Canadian settlers:

1. That the same amounts expended for foreign immigration be applied first to settle the sons of our large families residing in Canada or wishing to return from the United States.

2. That a special rate limited to less than one cent per mile to any district of settlement in Canada, either in Quebec or outside of Quebec, be granted to genuine settlers; that up to the age of seventeen inclusive, the children of settlers be transported free of charge to districts of settlement; that the same rate be granted, for a return ticket, to heads of families wishing to visit those districts with the object of settling there;

3. That an active campaign be carried on in the old parishes and the United States, with the object of making known the real advantages of our districts of settlement, as well as the advantages which should be granted by the Government to Canadian settlers with the object of stopping the exodus to the United States.

We feel confident that the resolution of the honourable member for Bellechasse, Mr. O. L. Boulanger, seconded by Mr. Boivin, member for Shefford, and by many other members, among them Messrs. P. F. Casgrain, for Charlevoix, Henri Bourassa for Labelle, C. E. St. Père for Hochelaga, Maxime Raymond, for Beauharnois, also big speeches already delivered, will meet with the unanimous approbation of the Government.

We also feel confident that, through the medium of our members, the Government will see fit to grant our legitimate claims.

This resolution bears the signatures of 125,000 people.

We are pleased to endorse the present petition. It puts forth reasons which seem to us very much to the point. Is it not right to grant to the native sons of this country the same advantages which are afforded to foreigners? We trust that the great effort undertaken in that direction will be crowned with success.

GEORGES,

Arch. coad. of Montreal.

Montreal, April 15, 1928.

CHAMBRE DE COMMERCE, MONTREAL

Resolution adopted by the Board of "la Chambre de Commerce", at its meeting held on Wednesday, April 18, 1928

IMMIGRATION

Whereas the Dominion Government is carrying on an active campaign of immigration both in the United States and Europe, it would therefore be desirable to include, in the advantages offered, the Canadians who wish to establish themselves in districts of settlement throughout Canada.

And whereas it behooves us to favour first the citizens of this country.

And whereas the present regime does not afford as many advantages to Canadians, who might want to establish themselves on lands of settlement, as it does to foreigners;

And whereas the surplus of our old Canadian parishes is the best element of settlement and we should not weaken before any sacrifice so as to keep it in this country.

That the enormous amounts expended for immigration purposes be applied in such a way as to favour first the settlement of our large families residing in Canada;

That a special rate limited to one cent per mile to any point of settlement in Canada, as follows: in the province of Quebec, New Brunswick, Ontario and Western Canada, be granted to genuine settlers; that up to the age of seventeen inclusive, the children of said settlers be transported free of charge to said districts; that the same rate be granted for a return ticket, to heads of families wishing to visit said districts with the object of settling there;

That an active campaign be carried on in the old parishes with the object of making known the real advantages of those districts of settlement, as well as the advantages offered by the Government to Canadian settlers.

True copy

J. C. Granes Contant,
Secretary.

THE CATHOLIC UNION OF FRENCH AND CANADIAN YOUTH

Local Committee of St. Boniface.

The following is a copy of a resolution adopted at the Local Congress of the A. C. J. C. of Manitoba, held at Letellier in 1927.

Whereas the transportation companies offer very low rates of transportation to immigrants arriving from Europe to settle the Canadian Western provinces, and that settlers coming from the Maritime provinces, Quebec and Ontario must pay the full fare and that therefore an unjust discrimination exists against the Canadian settler residing in the Eastern provinces, which induces him to emigrate to the United States instead of settling the Prairie provinces.

On the motion of the "Circle Ritchot," the "A. C. J. C." assembled in Congress at Letellier, June 12, 1927, do unanimously resolve: to request the authorities, having jurisdiction in regard to this discrimination which is detrimental to the best interests of Canada, to do away with this evil the soonest possible, thus placing the settlers from Eastern Canada on the same footing as the immigrants from Europe.

This resolution was unanimously adopted and followed by loud applause from the numerous congressmen gathered from every part of the province.

Sincerely devoted to J. C. and the A. C. J. C.

JOSEPH J. de AMBROSIS,
*Chief of the District Secretary's Office,
Manitoba.*

QUEBEC, April 13, 1928.

MR. L. C. BOULANGER, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

SIR:—At a regular meeting of the "Union Catholique de Voyageurs de Commerce" of Quebec, held on April 14, the following resolution was unanimously adopted.

1. That the same amounts expended for foreign immigration be applied to favour first, the settlement of the sons of our large families residing in Canada or wishing to return from the United States;

2. That a special rate limited to less than one cent per mile to whatsoever point of settlement in Canada, in Quebec or outside of Quebec, be granted to genuine settlers; that up to the age limit of seventeen inclusively, the children of said settlers be transported free of charge to districts of settlement;

That the same rates be granted, for a return ticket, to heads of families wishing to visit those districts with the object of settling there.

3. That an active campaign be carried on, with the object of making known the real advantages which should be granted by the Government to the Canadian settlers with the object of stopping the exodus to the United States.

Believe us,

Yours respectfully,

The "Union Catholique des Voyageurs de Commerce de Québec."

By ALPHONSE PATRY,

Corresponding Secretary.

PRODUCTIONS

Filed by Witness W. J. Egan

P.C. 183

Privy Council

Canada

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

WEDNESDAY, the 31st day of January, 1923.

PRESENT

His Excellency the Governor General in Council:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization, is pleased to rescind the Order in Council of the 9th day of May, 1922 (P.C. 717), and the same is hereby rescinded as from and after the 15th February, 1923:—

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, under the authority of section 38 of the Immigration Act, 9-10 Edward VII, chapter 27, as amended by 9-10 George V, chapter 25, and having regard to unemployment conditions now existing in Canada, is pleased to make the following regulation and the same is hereby made and established accordingly:—

From and after the 15th February, 1923, and until otherwise ordered, the landing in Canada of immigrants of all classes and occupations, is hereby prohibited, except as hereinafter provided:—

The Immigration Officer in Charge may notwithstanding the provisions of P.C. 23 of the 7th January, 1914, permit to land in Canada any

immigrant who otherwise complies with the provisions of the Immigration Act, if it is shown to his satisfaction that such immigrant is,—

- (1) A bona fide agriculturist entering Canada to farm and has sufficient means to begin farming in Canada.
- (2) A bona fide farm labourer entering Canada to follow that occupation and has reasonable assurance of employment.
- (3) A female domestic servant entering Canada to follow that occupation and has reasonable assurance of employment.
- (4) The wife or child under 18 years of age, of any person legally admitted to and resident in Canada, who is in a position to receive and care for his dependents.
- (5) A United States citizen entering Canada from the United States, provided it is shown to the satisfaction of the Immigration Officer in Charge, that his labour or service is required in Canada.
- (6) Any British subject entering Canada directly or indirectly from Great Britain or Ireland, Newfoundland, the United States of America, New Zealand, Australia or the Union of South Africa, who shall satisfy the Immigration Officer in Charge at the port of entry that he has sufficient means to maintain himself until employment is secured:—

Provided, that the only persons admissible under the authority of this clause are British subjects by reason of birth or naturalization in Great Britain or Ireland, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Australia or the Union of South Africa.

And provided further that the provisions of this Order in Council shall not apply to immigrants of any Asiatic race.

(Signed) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable

The Minister of Immigration and Colonization.

Filed by witness, W. J. Egan

P.C: 642

Privy Council

Canada

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

WEDNESDAY, the 11th day of April, 1923.

PRESENT

His Excellency the Governor General in Council:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the recommendation of the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization, is pleased to order that Clause (5) of the regulation established by Order in Council of the 31st of January, 1923, (P.C. 183) shall be and the same is hereby cancelled and the following substituted in lieu thereof:

- (5) Any United States citizen entering Canada from the United States who shall satisfy the Immigration Officer-in-Charge at the port of entry that he has sufficient means to maintain himself until employment is secured.

(Sgd.) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable,

The Minister of Immigration and Colonization.

Filed by witness, W. J. Egan

P.C. 534

Privy Council
Canada

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

THURSDAY, the 8th day of April, 1926.

PRESENT

His Excellency the Governor General in Council:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization, is pleased to amend the regulations with respect to the landing in Canada of immigrants, established by Order in Council (P.C. 183) of the 31st of January, 1923 (as amended by P.C. 642 of 11th April, 1923) and the same are hereby amended by the addition, immediately after Paragraph No. 6 of the following two new paragraphs:

- (7) A person who has satisfied the Minister that his labour or service is required in Canada.
- (8) The father or mother, the unmarried son or daughter eighteen years of age or over, the unmarried brother or sister, of any person legally admitted to and resident in Canada, who has satisfied the Minister of his willingness and ability to receive and care for such relative:

Provided that this clause shall not apply to the relative of any resident of Canada who himself failed to observe the conditions under which he was admitted to Canada.

(Sgd.) E. J. LEMAIRE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable,
The Minister of Immigration and Colonization.

FILED BY WITNESS W. J. EGAN

Statement of Grants made under the authority of the Governor General in Council

Name	1920-21	1921-22	1922-23	1923-24	1924-25	1925-26	1926-27	1927-28	Total
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Canadian Council of Immigration of Women	10,254 10								10,254 10
Agnes C. Laut	1,500 00								1,500 00
L'Union Nationale Française, Montreal	1,000 00		1,000 00	1,000 00					3,000 00
Salvation Army	15,000 00	26,500 00	26,500 00	35,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00		178,000 00
Dr. Barnardo's Home, Canadian Women's Hostel—		3,500 00	1,500 00						5,000 00
Halifax		500 00	350 00	350 00	350 00	350 00	350 00	350 00	2,600 00
St. John		500 00	500 00	500 00	500 00	500 00	500 00	500 00	3,500 00
Montreal		3,000 00	3,500 00	3,500 00	3,500 00	4,000 00	3,500 00	5,000 00	26,000 00
Toronto		750 00	500 00	500 00	500 00	500 00	700 00	2,000 00	5,450 00
Winnipeg		750 00	750 00	750 00	750 00	750 00	750 00	750 00	5,250 00
Regina		750 00	750 00	750 00	750 00	1,000 00	1,000 00	1,000 00	6,000 00
Calgary		500 00	600 00	600 00	600 00	1,500 00	1,500 00	2,500 00	7,800 00
Vancouver		350 00	250 00	250 00	250 00	350 00	350 00	350 00	2,150 00
St. George's Home, Ottawa		1,500 00	1,500 00						3,000 00
Middlemore Home, Halifax		1,000 00							1,000 00
Mr. Fegan's Home, Marchmont Home, Belleville		1,000 00							1,000 00
National Children's Home and Orphanage, Hamilton		1,000 00	1,000 00						2,000 00
Canada Colonization Assoc., Winnipeg			40,000 00	100,000 00					140,000 00
Scottish Immigration Aid Society				5,500 00	6,800 00	5,000 00	5,000 00		22,300 00
Canadian Y.M.C.A.				2,433 34	2,433 33				4,866 67
British Imm. and Colon. Assoc., Montreal						1,500 00	5,000 00	5,000 00	11,500 00
Town of Camrose							2,500 00		2,500 00
British Welcome and Welfare League, Toronto							2,500 00	1,000 00	3,500 00
Rev. Joseph Jean								250 00	250 00
Canadian Red Cross Society								3,244 44	3,244 44
Province of Ontario								5,000 00	5,000 00
	27,754 10	42,600 00	80,200 00	151,133 34	41,433 33	40,450 00	48,650 00	26,944 44	459,165 21

Resolution of the United Farmers of Canada, Saskatchewan Section, passed in convention at Moose Jaw, 1927.

(Ordered to be incorporated and printed in the record by resolution of the committee.)

Resolved: That the United Farmers of Canada in convention assembled do not approve of a vigorous immigration policy on the part of the government until our own unemployed are cared for and those brought out in former years are assimilated and stabilized and that we go on record as being opposed to the granting of any special privileges to those coming into the country which are not granted to our own citizens. This indicates clearly that we believe the immigration problem to be neither a religious question nor a question for corporations noa a question ofr any individual political party. It is entirely an economic question and we believe that the policy should be worked ont jointly by the provincial governments and the Dominion Government and the responsibility for carrying out that policy definitely placed on the department of immigration. And further that no one political party nor religious body nor corporations should be allowed to solicit or dmp immigrants indiscriminately within the Dominion of Canada but that all immigration activities should cease until the whole question has been thoroughly examined on a scientific and economic basis.

1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040	2041	2042	2043	2044	2045	2046	2047	2048	2049	2050	2051	2052	2053	2054	2055	2056	2057	2058	2059	2060	2061	2062	2063	2064	2065	2066	2067	2068	2069	2070	2071	2072	2073	2074	2075	2076	2077	2078	2079	2080	2081	2082	2083	2084	2085	2086	2087	2088	2089	2090	2091	2092	2093	2094	2095	2096	2097	2098	2099	2100
------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

The Honourable
The Minister of Immigration and Colonization

STATEMENT of persons on whose behalf letters to facilitate entry were issued on recommendation of Members of Parliament, etc., for the period April, 1926, to April, 1928, inclusive.

Col J. Arthurs, M.P.	32	Guthrie, Hon. Hugh	80
L. M. Auger, M.P.	2	Gordon, Hon. G. N.	18
R. K. Anderson, M.P.	1	Guerin, J. J., M.P.	16
A. Amirkanian, Brantford	23	Gott, E. J., M.P.	11
Armstrong, J. E., M.P.	5	Goulet, A., M.P.	38
Hon. Dr. Beland	1	Geary, Col. G. R., M.P.	35
Brady, J. C., M.P.	1	German, J. C. M., Toronto	15
Bancroft, L. P., M.P.	2	Goodison, T. W., M.P.	6
Bell, Thomas, M.P.	2	Girouard, W., M.P.	2
Bettez, Arthur, M.P.	1	German, W. M., M.P.	2
Black, Hon. W. A.	1	Gardiner, Robt., M.P.	1
Boys, W. A., M.P.	2	Gervais, Theodore, M.P.	1
Boulanger, O. L., M.P.	4	Goldfield, B., Ottawa	12
Bothwell, C. E., M.P.	2	Garfunkel, Mr., Toronto	16
Boivin, P. E., M.P.	7	Hatfield, Hon. Senator P. L.	1
Blanchard, S., M.P.	2	Harris, Joseph, M.P.	4
Bell, Leslie G., M.P.	27	Hall, Dr. W. A., M.P.	2
Benoit, A. J., M.P.	19	Heaps, A. A., M.P.	85
Bell, C. W., M.P.	9	Hall, T. F., K.C., Cobourg	24
Bowen, F. W., M.P.	2	Heenan, Hon. Peter, M.P.	10
Bradette, J., M.P.	3	Hanson, R. B., M.P.	1
Beaubien, A. L., M.P.	35	Howard, Chas. B., M.P.	14
Berger, Samuel, Ottawa	1	Hay, F. W., M.P.	8
Blatchford, K. A., M.P.	2	Harding, R. T., K.C., Toronto	13
Beaubien, Hon. C. P.	1	Hocken, H. C., M.P.	76
Boudreau, Lucien, M.L.A.	21	Homuth, Carl, M.P.P.	11
Bristol, Senator E.	4	Harmer, Senator	4
Chevrier, E. R. E., M.P.	47	Hepburn, M. F., M.P.	6
Church, T. L., M.P.	1	Hervey, General, contractor	300
Casgrain, Pierre, M.P.	14	Hunt, J. J., Hamilton	1
Cotnam, Dr. I. D., M.P.	34	Irwin, F. H. M., Toronto	1
Cascaden, Dr. J. H.	18	Jacobs, S. W., M.P.	143
Cannon, Hon. Lucien	4	Johnston, F. G., Toronto	19
Chaplin, Hon. J. D.	4	Jelliff, L. H., M.P.	3
Campbell, M. N., M.P.	1	King, Hon. J. H.	26
Cohen, J., Montreal	1	Kay, William, M.P.	16
Cayley, T. M., M.P.	1	Kaiser, Dr. T. E., M.P.	10
Chabot, Dr., M.P.	8	Karam, S., Ottawa	8
Deslisle, M. S., M.P.	8	Kerwin, P., Guelph	2
Deslauriers, Dr., M.P.	63	Lafamme, L. K., M.P.	14
Dubuc, J. E. A., M.P.	8	Lacombe, L., M.P.	2
Dunning, Hon. Chas.	15	Lang, Malcolm, M.P.	4
Denis, Dr. Arthur, M.P.	87	Lanctot, R., M.P.	2
Denis, J. J., M.P.	3	Lapointe, Hon. Ernest	14
Duff, Wm., M.P.	1	Lapierre, E. A., M.P.	31
Dickson, W. G., Toronto	1	Lawson, Dr. Smirle, Toronto	33
Edwards, A. M., M.P.	5	Lucas, W. T., M.P.	1
Elliott, Hon. J. C.	1	Leslie, Howard, Manitoba	22
Euler, Hon. W. D.	208	Lennox, Col. Herbert T., M.P.	4
Edwards, Gordon C., M.P.	93	Lawson, J. E., Toronto	5
Ellenson, E. M.	10	Lepofsky, S., Ottawa	2
Eisenberg, E., Toronto	5	McIntosh, C. R., M.P.	2
Fiset, Sir Eugene, M.P.	5	McCoig, Senator A. B.	14
Fontaine, Dr. J. E., M.P.	2	McClenaghan, Stewart, Ottawa	7
Fraser, W. A., Trenton	1	McGibbon, Dr. Peter, M.P.	3
Freiman, A. J.	33	MacDonald, Hon. E. M.	13
Forke, Hon. Robert, M.P.	2	McDonald, Finlay, M.P.	12

McMaster, A. R., K.C., M.P.	50
McLean, M., M.P.	3
McMillan, Thos., M.P.	3
Murray, Hon. E. J.	1
Mercier, J. A., M.P.	119
Morin, Rene, M.P.	1
Murphy & Donald, Toronto	12
Malcolm, J., M.P., Hon.	27
McPhail, Agnes, M.P.	1
Manion, Hon. Dr.	2
Maloney, Dr. M. J., M.P.	117
Mercier, Paul, M.P.	68
McPhee, G. W., M.P.	120
Murdock, Hon. James	1
Miles, Henry, M.L.C., Montreal	4
Massey, Hon. Vincent	1
Munn, W. C., Montreal	5
McGuire, W. H., Toronto	1
Matthews, R. C., M.P.	8
Motherwell, Hon. W. R.	1
Martin, Hon. John S., Toronto	1
Margosches, Mrs., Ottawa	3
Monahan, T. L., Toronto	33
Monte, P. F., Hon.	3
Neill, A. W., M.P.	5
Odette, E. G., M.P.	20
O'Neil, J. Ray, M.P.	109
Ornstein, A., Ottawa	11
O'Heir, Ald. Thos. J., Hamilton	2
Power, Chas. G., M.P.	17
Pettit, G. H., M.P.	37
Pouliot, J. P., M.P.	7
Preston, Dr. R. F., M.P.	4
Price, A. B., M.P.	1
Preston, W. T. R., Cobourg	10
Perley, Sir George	1
Perras, F. W., M.P.	13
Prevost, J. E., M.P.	3
Peck, E. A., M.P.	1
Robinson, Col., M.P.	2
Ross, J. G., M.P.	1
Rennie, Dr. G. S., M.P.	2

Rheaume, J. T., M.P.	22
Rinfret, Hon. Fernand	31
Ralston, Hon. J. L.	8
Raymond, M., M.P.	15
Robb, Hon. J. A.	15
Robitaille, Clement, M.P.	16
Ross, A. E., M.P.	2
Ryckman, Hon. E. B., M.P.	4
Ryerson, R. E., M.P.	8
Robbins, Major S. J.	29
Rose, Bernard, K.C., Montreal	2
Rutherford, Dr. J. W., M.P.	2
Smith, R. K., M.P.	8
Senn, M. C., M.P.	2
Spence, D., M.P.	18
Shipway, Thos., Toronto	13
Stinson, J. H., M.P.	13
Stevens, Hon. H. H., M.P.	3
Semple, G. H., Montreal	4
Smoke, F., M.P.	1
Sifton, Harry, Toronto	2
Smith, Hon. Lewis, Fredericton	1
Smith, Arnold N., M.P.	6
St. Pere, E. C., M.P.	3
Simpson, T. E., M.P.	3
Stewart, H. A., M.P.	3
Seguin, P. A., M.P.	6
Short, H. B., M.P.	4
Sanderson, F. G., M.P.	29
Sinclair, Hon. J. E.	1
Tobin, E. W., M.P.	1
Telford, W. P., M.P.	3
Thorson, J. T., M.P.	3
Tobin, S. G., Toronto	6
Veniot, Hon. P. J.	15
Vallance, John, M.P.	6
White, R. S., M.P.	8
Weiss, B., Ottawa	7
Young, E. J., M.P.	3
Young, A. MacG., M.P.	6
Young, Col. N. M., M.P.	7

INDEX OF WITNESSES

	PAGE
Amyot, Dr. J. A.....	211-229
Barton, Professor H.....	529-543
Beatty, E. W.....	345-365
Black, W. J.....	283-322
Burd, Rev. Canon W.....	367-407
Campbell, M. N. (M.P.).....	727-731
Chamberlain, Albert.....	456-478
Childs, Miss Gertrude.....	426-455
Clark, Dr. David A.....	626-647
Coldwell, M. J.	677-700, 703-708
Corbett, George H.	576-586
Culshaw, Staff-Capt. Owen.....	606-626
Dennis, J. S.	511-522
Egan, W. J.....	3-108, 117-210, 478
Farthing, Hugh	479-499
Flavelle, Sir Joseph.....	422-425
Forke, Hon. Robert.....	714-722
Jolliffe, A. L.....	648-675
Langley, Hon. George.....	544-562
Macalister, J. N. K.....	230-282
MacKie, Miss M. E.	562-569
Magrath, C. A.....	501-511
Manion, Hon. Dr. (M.P.).....	701-703
McMurray, Hon. E. J.	723-727
Stibbard, Col. James.....	523-528
Thornton, Sir Henry.....	325-344
Tudge, Lt.-Col. T. R.	586-606
Vernon, Rev. Canon W.	409-421
Williams, Lt.-Col. Cecil G.	570-576

INDEX TO PRODUCTIONS

	PAGE
British Family Scheme, statement by applicant and wife.....	744
Canadian Pacific Railway Co., statement of immigrants brought from (a) British Isles, (b) Preferred countries, (c) Non-Preferred countries, 1927, 1928.....	782, 783
Cases cited by witness Childs, of immigrants becoming public charges.....	809
Census reports of immigrants found resident in Western provinces in June, 1926, from (a) British Isles, (b) Continent.....	764
Continental immigration, occupations, 1927.....	763
Contracts and arrangements between Department and societies and organizations—memorandum <i>re</i>	754
Emigrants from Great Britain and Northern Ireland, 1926-7 (a) to Canada, (b) to other parts of Empire.....	763
European immigration, farmers and domestics, 1920-1927.....	761
Expenditure of Department, 1927—administration, immigration, colonization.....	762
Forms—	
Nomination, C.P. Ry. Co.....	735
Farm Worker.....	740
British Family.....	742
Houseworkers "E".....	745
Forms, "A", "B", "C", "D".....	792
Steamship interrogatory.....	793
Canadian Government return.....	800
Steamship manifest.....	804
Government agencies in United States.....	738
Great Britain and Ireland.....	739
Europe.....	739
Grants made under Order in Council to societies and organizations, 1920-1928.....	821
Health Department, Orders in Council and sections of Act authorizing medical inspection by.....	756, 759
Health branch, Department of Immigration, employees.....	757
Instructions to steamship pursers.....	802
Instructions to agents in U.S.....	748
Letters of Admission, statement of persons on whose behalf letters to facilitate entry were issued on recommendation of Members of Parliament, etc.....	823
McDonald (McDowall), Flora, correspondence and memo <i>re</i>	807
Orders in Council—P.C. 183, 642, 534.....	818
Petition presented by French Canadians.....	813
Railways agreement, as amended and extended.....	732
Railway companies' immigration from Continent, 1926, 1927.....	762
Repatriation agents, number of agents—expenditures, 1889-1927.....	781
number of persons repatriated—reports of agents.....	784
Scottish Immigrant Aid Society, 1922-1927.....	780
Soldier Settlement Scheme, statistics.....	764
Statement showing nationality, sex, occupation and destination of immigrants from the continent, 1920-1923, 1926, 1928.....	766
Three Thousand Family Scheme, statistics.....	764
United Farmers of Canada, Saskatchewan Br. resolution.....	822
Witnesses, productions filed by	
Boulanger, O. L. (M.P.).....	813-818
Childs, Gertrude.....	809-812
Dennis, J. S.....	783
Egan, W. J.....	732-781, 784-791, 818-821
Jolliffe, A. L.....	792-808
Macalister, J. N. K.....	782

